DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 612 SP 002 834

By-Corman, Bernard R.; Olmsted, Ann G.
The Internship in the Preparation of Elementary School Teachers. A Description and Analysis of a Program.
Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Coll. of Education.
Spons Agency-Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
Pub Date 64
Note-109p.
Available from-Bureau of Educational Research, Michigan State University, 252 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, Michigan ($1.00)
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.55
Descriptors-Elementary School Teachers, *Internship Programs, Practicum Supervision, *Preservice Education, Student Teaching, Teacher Interns
Identifiers-Michigan State University, STEP, Student Teacher Education Project

This descriptive analysis of Michigan State's Student Teacher Education Project (STEP) focuses on the problems encountered in its acceptance and first five years of operation. Basic data for the analysis was obtained from systematic evaluation interviews with students, their instructors and supervisors, and members of the project staff. Chapter 1 describes the origins and the initial 5-year plan in which students completing a 2-year junior college program enter a professional sequence consisting of three campus summer sessions stressing liberal arts and three years in a "cooperating center" (a single community college and at least one school system) where they experience a 1-year preinternship with student teaching and a 2-year internship. Chapter 2 describes recruitment and screening of students by the cooperating centers. Chapter 3 discusses "University Instruction in a School Setting: Problems of the Preinternship" including the effects on instruction of the removal of campus constraints. Chapter 4, "Problems of the Internship," describes provision for intern supervision, the intern consultant's role, and the intern-consultant relationship. Included also are a chapter of conclusions with summary of the revised 4-year plan and an appendix containing data on STEP students. (JS)

ED030612

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE INTERNSHIP IN THE PREPARATION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

A DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF A PROGRAM

BERNARD R. CORMAN
and
ANN G. OLMSTED

College of Education/Michigan State University
1964

SP002834

Additional copies may be obtained for $1.00 each from the Bureau of Educational Research, Michigan State University, 252 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, Michigan

FOREWORD

In recent years educators of teachers have expressed renewed interest in the potential of internship experiences as a part of teacher education programs. The present volume grows out of five years' experience by the College of Education at Michigan State University with an experimental internship program for elementary teachers.

Although the Michigan State program which was called STEP (Student Teacher Education Program), dealt exclusively with the education of elementary teachers, we believe that the knowledge gained from the program has applicability to and can highlight significant issues in other teacher education programs.

The STEP program was conducted in cooperation with selected Michigan public school systems and their affiliated community-junior colleges and was supported by a generous grant from the Ford Foundation. We are deeply indebted to the Ford Foundation for facilitating a comprehensive test of the contribution of the internship concept to teacher education.

As a consequence of this experimental effort in teacher education, Michigan State University has incorporated significant features of the STEP design in its regular elementary teacher preparation program. Presently more than 500 students are enrolled in what is now designated as the *Elementary Intern Program.*

This report on the project was prepared by Dr. Bernard R. Corman, an educational psychologist, and Dr. Ann Olmsted, a sociologist. They have headed a research team which, in carrying out a research project focused on the socialization of the teacher to the occupation of teaching, has carefully studied and appraised the program throughout its existence.

The success of any innovation is dependent on the enthusiasm and work of many. Special recognition should be given to Dr. William Vernon Hicks who has served as project director of STEP through its entire existence. His skillful administrative leadership was invaluable to the success of the experiment.

There are many other individuals whose cooperative efforts made this experiment possible. For their contributions we are indeed grateful. The members of the State Board of Education in Michigan, public school superintendents and junior college deans, coordinators and intern consultants are only a few whose willingness to venture down unmarked paths made this program possible. A list of some of these people appears in Appendix B.

Leland W. Dean, Director
School of Teacher Education and
Assistant Dean, College of Education
Michigan State University

PREFACE

Michigan State University's College of Education organized an internship program for the preparation of elementary school teachers in the Fall of 1959. Called the Student-Teacher Education Project (STEP), the program was conceived as a five-year plan which would include a one-year pre-internship and student teaching experience followed by a two-year internship.

From its inception, STEP provided for an evaluation unit which eventually defined its contribution under two main headings: (a) the completion of a longitudinal study of the socialization of the elementary school teacher and (b) a continuous feedback into operations of evaluations based on systematic depth interviews with students, their instructors and supervisors, and with members of the project staff. These interviews form the basic data for the description and analysis which follows.

The evaluation unit was administered independently from other project operations and was not directly involved in teaching either the pre-interns or interns. It was made clear to students and staff that the evaluation unit would have no role in the selection, retention, advancement, or placement of individuals though, of course, members of the unit might be consulted on general policy matters. Whether this administrative separation succeeded in its purpose of inducing the interviewees to be completely frank is debatable.

But the high incidence of critical comments and volunteered confidences once it was demonstrated that these commitments would be honored suggests that the main purpose of the administrative arrangement was achieved.

Our socialization studies will be the subject of separate publications. What we seek to do in this monograph is to present both a description and an analysis of the development of Michigan State's internship program and of the problems encountered in its acceptance and operation. Our hope is that this analysis will be useful to the many persons now engaged in the elaboration of similar programs and to others who may be contemplating traveling this road.

We will more frequently analyze problems encountered, both those solved and unsolved, than is typical in report literature of this genre. In part our more analytical approach results from an early decision of the evaluation unit. It became quickly apparent that any *direct* comparison of the "effectiveness" of the internship and on-campus preparation programs would be sterile. The opportunities and constraints inherent in the two approaches to the training of teachers proved to be so different, the students enrolled in each so dissimilar in their social backgrounds, and the immediate objectives of instruction so disparate, that a direct comparison of the graduates of the two plans seemed to us irrelevant. Even more important, the purpose for which such comparisons are usually undertaken—that of aiding in the eventual decision to retain or drop a program—was not a pressing matter. In this instance the decision could be based on more realistic considerations than are ordinarily available in evaluating educational endeavors. If the internship met a valid need in the judgment of school administrators, and was accepted by building principals, established teachers and parents, all would insist on its continuance; if the results were unsatisfactory, for whatever reason, no test comparisons marshalled to show the "superiority" of STEP graduates would insure the program's continuation. The program thus, had to meet the test of the marketplace.

The possibility that the internship would be endorsed in the marketplace for the "wrong" reasons was, of course, not excluded. But until some method is found for defining and measuring teaching performance on a criterion which is both widely accepted and non-trivial, no adequate substitute for the test of the marketplace is available.[1]

Whatever the wisdom of the decision not to undertake a direct comparison of internship and on-campus graduates, its effect was a happy one. It freed the staff from any compulsion to "prove" the superiority of the internship approach. We could turn our attention to the examination of more important issues. If then, in what follows, we devote more attention to problems than in pointing to triumphs, it does not follow that successes have not occurred. The internship approach at Michigan State University has proved a viable one. On the basis of five years' experience, the decision to continue the program permanently, although with modifications, as an alternative route to teacher certification has been made, and ratified by the State of Michigan's licensing authorities. The opportunity to prepare for teaching in this way has been extended to additional students and the principle has been applied to training programs in other areas.

It is our view that a greater service can be rendered if we explore what we view as the potential and the limitations of the internship in teacher education, rather than engage in its uncritical advocacy as an answer to all of the ills of teacher education. For we feel that there are no panaceas in education, in the field of teacher preparation least of all. All variations in the preparation of teachers have their unique advantages and disadvantages and all have their problems. It comes down finally to a value judgment as to which set of problems one prefers to engage.

---

[1] The point of view we take has been succinctly put by Heath in a different connection, as follows: "It seems most unlikely that any single experiment will provide the answer to the omnibus question which is better? This is not because the experiment is poorly designed, but because the question is unanswerable in the general case. The fault in this question is not that it calls for a value judgment and not that it calls for data. Its defect is that it calls for both, at the same time, inextricably mixed." Robert W. Heath, "Pitfalls in the Evaluation of New Curricula," *Science Education*, XLVI (April, 1962), 216.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 THE CASE FOR AN INTERNSHIP IN THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS
- A. Definition of Internship 1
- B. The Origins of the STEP Program 4
- C. The Initial Plan 6
- D. The Argument for the Initial Plan 9
- E. Differences Among Internship Programs 13

Chapter 2 ASSEMBLING A STUDENT BODY
- A. Attracting Students 16
- B. The Students Attracted 20
- C. What Happened to the Students? 26

Chapter 3 UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTION IN A SCHOOL SETTING: PROBLEMS OF THE PRE-INTERNSHIP
- A. The Initial Programs 30

B. The Effects of the Removal of Campus Constraints on Instruction 32
C. The Impact of Work in a School on Instruction in Pedagogy 43
D. Achieving a Balance Between the Technical and the Professional 56

Chapter 4 PROBLEMS OF THE INTERNSHIP
A. Providing Supervision for the Interns 62
B. Defining the Intern Consultant's Role. 65
C. The Effects of the Building Milieu on the Intern-Consultant Relationship 76

Chapter 5 CONCLUDING POINTS AND A SUMMARY
The Present Status of the Internship at Michigan State University. 89
On the Uses of an Internship in the Education of Teachers 91

APPENDIX A
The Socioeconomic Background of the STEP Students 95
Achievement and Aptitude 96
Comparison on Personality and Interest Measures. 97

APPENDIX B
Campus Project Staff. 99
Program Planning Committee, 1959-1960. 99
Coordinators. 99
Intern Consultants 100

CHAPTER 1

THE CASE FOR AN INTERNSHIP

A. DEFINITION OF INTERNSHIP

Whatever their other differences, most of those advocating reform in the preparation of teachers agree on the worth of a period of supervised practice. For Conant, practice teaching is the one "indisputably essential element"; for Shaplin, any denial of the worth of practice teaching represents a serious underestimation of the complexity of the teaching process; for an NEA task force on teacher education, direct experience is essential if ideas are to be made meaningful and if "doing" as well as "knowing" is to result.[1]

Underlying this general recognition of the importance of practice is an awareness of the gap between what the aspiring teacher can learn in her college classes and the situations she will confront as a teacher.[2] Even if one admits that there is much to learn *about* teaching, and not all are ready to concede the point, formal instruction in the methods of teaching often must deal in abstractions, generalizations or, given the present state of knowledge, in prescriptions. The application of such "theory" is not obvious, for there is seldom any necessary implication from the theory to a preferred course of action in a specific situation.[3]

---

[1] James B. Conant, *The Education of American Teachers*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963, p. 142; Judson T. Shaplin "Practice in Teaching," p. 80, in Elmer R. Smith, (ed,) *Teacher Education*, New York: Harper & Row, 1962; Margaret Lindsey (editor). *New Horizons for the Teaching Profession*. National Education Association, 1961, p. 66f. But not everybody agrees; for a contrary opinion compare Donald W. Oliver and James P. Shaver. "A cri[illegible] Practice in Teaching" *Harvard Educational Review* 31: 437-448, Fall, 1961.

Over the years many devices have been tried to help bridge the gap between theory and practice: "laboratory schools" connected with colleges of education, work in community agencies, the so-called September experience, and the like. Practice teaching itself has expanded into a full-time quarter or semester devoted exclusively to work in an on-going school situation. Not only has the time spent increased but the language used reflects the changes in purpose: one now speaks of "student" rather than "practice" teaching, of a "supervising" or "cooperating" teacher rather than a "critic" teacher.

Yet none of these devices has sufficed to insure a smooth induction of the beginner into teaching. And, thus, in the most recent period many colleges of education have experimented with some form of an "internship." The movement has been spurred by copious grants from the Ford Foundation, but it would be ungenerous to conclude, as have some, that the availability of "seed-money" was the principal cause of these recent innovations. The medical analogy has been before the teacher-educator for half a century, and pleas for the introduction of a comparable internship for teachers at least as long.[4] It is ironic that these pleas should now be answered in a period when the medical internship is itself under serious attack.[5]

The advocacy of an "internship" in the preparation and induction of teachers is, thus, hardly a new cause. Nor have earlier attempts to install it been lacking. Especially during the economic depression of the thirties, many individual school systems established an "internship" as a prerequisite to regular employment and some universities made available an internship in teaching as a variant of their other work-study programs. Unfortunately, in too many instances, the "internship" was an expedient used to justify exploiting beginning teachers.[6] As a result the internship fell into disfavor among some educators even though many legitimate plans, a few of which still survive, originated during this period.

---

[2] One of the conventions of teacher educators is to use the masculine in speaking of teachers, even when elementary school teachers are described. Since nearly 80% of all elementary school teachers are women, this convention smacks of a belief in word magic. We shall use the feminine.

[3] Compare the different situation that holds for the engineer. The physical laws he studies do directly imply what he will propose for a given engineering problem. The point is developed further in B. Paul Kosimar and James McClellan, "The Logic of Slogans," in B. Othaniel Smith and Robert Ennis (eds.), *The Language of Education*, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1961, pp. 195-214.

[4] Howard Jones *et al.*, *Description of Internship Programs*, Washington, D. C.: National Association of Supervisors of Student Teaching, 1941.

[5] George E. Miller. "Medicine," pp. 103-119. In Nelson B. Henry (editor), *Education for the Professions*. NSSE 61st Yrbk. Part II. University of Chicago Press, 1962.

In both the older and newer "internship" programs, the specific provisions have varied so widely that it will be helpful to make explicit what we ourselves denote by the term. In our discussion, an "internship" will mean an adequately supervised, full-time teaching experience which follows an organized program of formal instruction in pedagogy and which precedes certification. It is assumed that the internship will be pursued in a regular school, as opposed to a university-administered laboratory school. The prior instruction may or may not accompany some form of supervised work in the schools. Where it does, we shall speak of a "pre-internship"; where, as in most preparation programs, the prior instruction is essentially didactic, we shall call it an "on-campus" program. We shall discriminate between "student-teaching" and the "internship"—even though both follow prior instruction—by implying a paid and extended period of training in our use of the latter term.[7]

As we shall employ the term, then, an internship will presuppose that the intern has already acquired—either in a pre-internship or on a college campus—many of the specialized skills and much of the knowledge believed fundamental to actual practice. This requirement will differentiate the internship from "apprenticeship" plans in which students enter into a practicing situation without any prior formal study of teaching. Also central in our definition is the requirement for supervision of the interns. Lacking this, programs called "internships" often are either simply means to exploit the student or circumvent existing certification requirements.

---

[6] The senior author encountered one of these programs on graduation from college: an offer of a year's "internship" at $30 a month. No supervision was provided.

[7] Our definition is more limited than that usually employed. Flowers, for example, defines an internship as an advanced level of student teaching by a college graduate. Cf. John Flowers and others, *Recommended Standards Governing Professional Laboratory Experiences and Student Teaching and Evaluative Criteria*. American Association College Teachers of Education, 1949. Our definition follows an analysis in Ronald G. Rex, *A Theory of the Internship in Professional Training*, Michigan State University, College of Education Dissertation Series, No. 7, 1964.

B. THE ORIGINS OF THE STEP PROGRAM[8]

Michigan State was first approached with a proposal to establish an "internship" program nearly five years before its Student-Teacher Education Program (STEP) came into being. At that time the College of Education was asked to sponsor a plan through which the graduates of one of Michigan's larger two-year community colleges could go directly into an "internship" at the beginning of their third college year. The University was asked to offer courses through its extension services and summer session so that the "interns" could meet certification and degree requirements. The proposal was allowed to languish for a number of practical reasons, but also because it was felt that an unsupervised apprenticeship rather than an internship was contemplated.

There are those who argue that no valid substantive knowledge exists on which to base a program of professional education in teaching and that once the student has mastered the subjects he will teach he is equipped for the classroom. If this view is held, an apprenticeship program is indeed a reasonable proposal. However, if the underlying assumption is tenable it would hardly seem to be the business of a university to oversee an apprenticeship. Such programs could be directed more effectively by the professional organizations most concerned with protecting standards.

Two years after this initial inquiry, the deans of widely separated community colleges located in the more rural areas of Michigan made a new proposal. The state legislature had ruled that all of the remaining two-year teacher training institutions in the state would be closed by 1961. The community college deans agreed that a bachelor's degree was a desirable minimum requirement for certification as a teacher. But a crisis could be anticipated—given the general shortage of teachers, the relatively low college attendance rate of high school graduates in the outstate areas, and the difficulty of attracting fully certified teachers to rural schools. Could not some alternative program be instituted that would alleviate the situation? Since these rural school systems would have to continue to hire specially certified teachers in any event, could not a program of extension courses be arranged to permit such individuals to continue studying for a degree and regular certification?

Once again the initial response of the College of Education was less than enthusiastic, despite Michigan State's land-grant tradition which inclines its faculty to be sympathetic to such requests for assistance. One of the community college deans proved most persistent, however. Two members of the university staff finally studied the community college and university catalogs to answer the simple question of whether the requirements of the two institutions and the state certification authority could be met in a program that would meet the emergency and yet be intellectually honest. They found that a solution was possible if a full-time university staff member was stationed in the community to provide the necessary instruction in pedagogy and if on-campus summer sessions were utilized to complete the required study in the liberal arts.

---

[8] Much of the material in this and the immediately following sections is based on interviews with individuals who had the biggest role in developing the program at Michigan State: the late Dean Clifford Erickson, Leland Dean, William Hawley, and Milosh Muntyan. The interviews were all taken in 1959, and reflect what these individuals hoped the program would accomplish, rather than their assessment of what it has. The interpretation is, of course, that of the authors of this report.

It would require too much detail to trace the succeeding history of the proposal as it was taken through the college and university machinery, to the deans and superintendents of the community colleges and school systems, to the Michigan Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (TEPS) and other professional groups, and to the State Board of Education. What is important to note is that as a result of this necessary search for legitimatization, a modest attempt to solve a crisis situation emerged as a program which could be advocated on its own merits, quite apart from the specific problem which had called it into being.

The internship program at Michigan State, then, developed structure not as the result of a revolutionary "breakthrough" idea, but out of the vagaries of the legitimatization process itself. The potential in the original proposal was uncovered as individuals and groups at each level of the institutional hierarchy reacted in terms of their own special responsibilities for the preparation of teachers.

To illustrate the point with a single example: the then director of the universitv's off-campus programs evinced no great interest in the initial proposal to aid a few rural communities meet their need for teachers. But he did see in the proposal a means by which the University's relationship with all community colleges in the state could be materially strengthened; this was a matter of concern to him since he was sensitive to the rapidly expanding importance of the community college for future University enrollments. "Bring me back," he said in effect, "a plan that can be taken to every community college in the state." This was done, and this effort to generalize the plan uncovered many new possibilities. In a like manner, each group and individual whose approval had to be won shaped the final proposal and, more importantly, charged with interesting opportunities what had been viewed originally as little more than a manipulation of existing routines.

It was not so much that the legitimizers saw more clearly than others. But in seeking to relate the proposal to their own concerns, they caused the initiating group to add new dimensions and to make explicit what had been latent.

Those who seek to innovate in education often seem compelled to announce the discovery of a panacea. Perhaps this compulsion to claim all virtue testifies to the shaky base on which experimental programs in education necessarily rest. In any case, often the sole effect of an assertion of a revolutionary "breakthrough" is to increase the likelihood that a new program will threaten entrenched organizational interests. The slow and careful push for the approval of STEP, on the other hand, helped insure that the changes asked for would be seen as essentially compatible with existing purposes. And the wide involvement of those with power in the educational establishment improved the chances that the program would survive when, and if, major differences became apparent.

Winning approval for the new program was a long and often frustrating experience; nearly two years were devoted to the process. When first presented, the proposal was blocked simply because the University found itself squeezed in one of the austerity periods characteristic of state institutions. The necessary developmental costs could not be underwritten out of regular revenues. Later it was learned that the Ford Foundation was preparing to support internships in teacher education and while the STEP proposal differed in a number of ways from the fifth-year programs the Foundation was underwriting, it was similar enough in purpose to merit support. The grant of $585,000 which was made proved crucial in meeting the developmental costs of the program.

C. THE INITIAL PLAN

As finally hammered out, the proposal for an internship program at Michigan State included a number of structural provisions which made possible a substantive change in the preparation of teachers.

At least one full-time University faculty member was to make his home in each cooperating "center" and serve as a "resident coordinator." The coordinator would be a permanent staff member, would hold regular academic rank and earn advancement and tenure based on the same criteria used for "on-campus" faculty. He would be directly attached to a department within the College of Education and, though charged with special administrative responsibilities, would be a person competent to teach some part of the professional sequence. The purpose of these stipulations was to underline the College's intention to accord the program and those associated with it full status, and to signal the College's firm commitment that the program not be perceived as a temporary or marginal operation. (Later, when enrollments justified it, "assistant coordinators" were also assigned to the centers. These were advanced doctoral degree candidates appointed on a four-fifths time basis who helped with the advising and instructing of the pre-interns.)

Each of the centers was to encompass a single community college and one or more school systems. Students would typically, though not necessarily, attend a community college for their first two years of study. Applicants who had attended Michigan State or any other accredited school would also be accepted but, in any case, those wishing to be admitted would be expected to meet all regular requirements for transfer into the College of Education with junior class standing.

The resident coordinator in each center would organize a screening committee composed of himself and representatives of the school system. (In one center the school representatives were initially chosen from the administrative hierarchy, but in all other centers classroom teachers predominated.) Each applicant who met the academic requirements would be interviewed by this screening committee which would decide upon the acceptability of the student as a future member of the profession. One might argue that an interview is hardly a valid method for determining a candidate's potential as a teacher, but no better method exists. (As it turned out, few of the initial applicants were rejected in any event.) The intent, however, was clear: those already established in the profession would be asked to take a more active role in determining who should be permitted to prepare for teaching.

The selected students would begin their professional preparation by attending a summer session on the East Lansing campus with their course work concentrated in the liberal arts. At the end of this first summer the student would return to her home center to begin a pre-internship year. The resident coordinator, faculty commuting from campus, and school personnel would direct the students in a period of intensive formal instruction in pedagogy and in related work in the schools. During the first two quarters of this pre-internship year the student would spend about half of each week in direct contact with children and schools, would gradually be given greater responsibility for teaching, and the year would then culminate in a twelve-week full-time student-teaching experience. During the pre-internship year the student would be in a one-to-one relationship with a supervising teacher and, hopefully, would work in a number of different schools and grade levels. The pre-intern would receive no pay and, except for her student teaching term, would earn no college credit for her work in the schools.

At the end of the pre-internship year a second screening would occur and those students retained would return to the university campus for a second summer session. The focus of studies would again shift to the liberal arts.

By the end of the second summer the student would have completed three and a half years of college work and met all existing state certification course requirements in professional education. She would now receive special certification and begin a two-year internship.

As an intern, the student would be fully responsible for a class and perform all of the duties expected of any other beginning teacher. The major difference would be that she would receive the help of an "intern consultant." Persons appointed to this new position were to be employees of the school systems within a center, but selected jointly by school administrators and the resident coordinator. The intern consultant's sole responsibility would be to guide a number of interns through their first years of teaching; the consultant would neither teach classes of her own nor replace the building principal in the evaluation of the intern. For first-year interns the ratio of consultants to interns would be held to one-to-five; this ratio would expand to one-to-ten during the second internship year.[9]

In a sense the intern would pay for her consultant's services. During the first year the intern would receive approximately two-thirds of the salary normally paid to a beginning teacher and this would increase to about three-fourths pay during the second year. The difference between what the interns would receive and what an equal number of beginning teachers would have been paid would underwrite the cost of the consultants' salaries (most of whom would be at the upper levels of their system's salary schedule).[10] The school systems would also absorb the costs of providing classroom space for the pre-interns and offices for the coordinator and consultants. To guard against any balance accruing to the school system—and any legitimate charge that "cheap" teachers were being employed—a clear understanding was to be reached that any savings to the schools were to be ploughed back into the program in the form of higher pay for the interns, scholarships for the pre-interns, or instructional materials for use by the pre-interns. Ford Foundation funds were to be used to establish the nucleus of a professional library in each center, but additions would be made in subsequent years out of the university's regular operating budget.

---

[9] In many important ways the "internship consultant" position anticipated the "clinical professor" Conant was later to advocate. The principal difference is in the strength of the university connection of the latter. Conant's description, however, is close to STEP's conception: Cf. James Conant, *op. cit.*, p. 142f.

[10] Paul Woodring, "The New Look in Teacher Education," American Association of College Teachers of Education 11th Yearbook, 1958, pp. 9-25. In this speech Woodring recommended an arrangement very much like the one used in STEP. So far as we can determine, STEP is the only program that has tried to put this idea into practice.

During the two years of their internship, the students would enroll for the equivalent of a three-credit course each term to be taught in their communities. And, finally, the interns would attend a third campus summer session. At the close of the second year's internship they would be awarded a Bachelor of Arts degree and regular certification as a teacher.

This, then, was the proposal which was taken to school superintendents and to the community colleges. Initially six community colleges and fourteen school systems decided to join with the University in sponsoring the program.

D. THE ARGUMENT FOR THE INITIAL PLAN

Those who initiated and those who decided to participate in the program just described, felt it had a number of clear advantages. There were, first of all, several obvious practical benefits for the students, the schools, and the University. Many students who would otherwise be unable to finance four years of college would be helped to do so; the intern would earn a salary of approximately $6,500 in the two years of her internship. The school systems would receive assistance, if only partial, with their nagging teacher turnover problem. The University would open new and important channels of communication with community colleges and public school systems.

But while these, and other, practical considerations were undoubtedly persuasive in winning initial acceptance, they were not the only, or determining arguments for the program.

Many students who now elect to prepare for teaching do so for quite incidental reasons: some major has to be declared; teaching is an acceptable form of employability insurance; the college grapevine reports grades are easier to earn in education courses. The list could be expanded but what these and similar motives point up is the fact that many students, if indeed not most, enter training programs viewing teaching as a "contingent occupation." It is work they will do if something else does not happen: marriage, a preferred job, and so forth.[11] The proposed program was to be a stringent one. This was to be no short and easy program designed principally to circumvent existing certification requirements. These requirements may be impossible to defend on any other basis, but at least they have the virtue of forcing the applicant for a teaching license to make *some* sacrifice of time and effort. The STEP program went far beyond minimum requirements in its demands. Exclusive of holiday breaks, from the close of her sophomore year to the program's end the student would have only five weeks free in three years. (The second summer session was a shortened term.) She would be required to invest large blocks of time working in schools during her pre-internship year, and for this work she would receive neither pay nor college credit. She would be asked to submit to a long and continuous evaluation. Whatever else the program might or might not do, it would screen out students whose desire to teach was minimal.

---

[11] Ward S. Mason, Robert J. Dressel and Robert K. Bain, "Sex Role and the Career Orientations of Beginning Teachers," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXIX, (Fall, 1962), 370-383.

Even when more acceptable motives underlie a student's decision to become a teacher, there is no guarantee that the student will find teaching satisfying. The love of children or of learning may be necessary conditions for finding such satisfactions, but they are not sufficient. It is often assumed, both by the student preparing to enter teaching and by some of her advisers, that because the student has spent so many years as a pupil herself, and because she has observed others teach, she is completely aware of the nature of the demands that will be made of her as an elementary school teacher. But this assumption is not always warranted.

There is a side of teaching that the outsider may understand intellectually but whose emotional impact she cannot appreciate. The deadening effect of routine, the frequent gap between what is planned and what is accomplished, the necessity of making judgments in the absence of knowledge, the pull of the child who tries and fails, the push of the conflicting expectations of parents—all these, and other aspects of teaching can be described and analyzed. But a reality test is needed before the would-be teacher can prove the extent of her personal commitment, and her willingness to meet these challenges.

The typical student-teaching experience is, of course, an attempt to provide just such a reality test. But it is severely limited. For one thing it is too short. For another, even if the student learns that teaching is not personally satisfying, student teaching usually comes too late in the college career to make a shift to another field practical. Moreover, even in the full-time student-teaching arrangement (in contrast, say, to the hour or two of practice teaching that used to be typical), the student teacher is protected from the full impact of the pressures that she will eventually face as a teacher. The class is, after all, not the student's own. The student is shielded by her supervising teacher, by her own absorption with the technical problems of teaching, by her concern for her own performance, and most of all, by her initial enthusiasm for the children. Most of the pressures that complicate the induction of the new teacher will not become apparent until the graduate takes her first job.

For the schools, one result is that the turnover of staff, severe enough for other reasons, is aggravated as beginning teachers discover that their choice of teaching may have been based on a misunderstanding of the real nature of the occupation and their suitability for it. Many leave teaching; but more tragic is the new teacher who finds herself trapped even when her initial enthusiasm has given way to quiet desperation, and her early concern for children and and their learning replaced by patient time-serving.

It is true, of course, that there are those who seem "born to teach" and others for whom it would be fatuous to predict the traumatic first years we have just suggested. There are those, too, who never see in teaching more than just another job, more secure than most, but presenting neither special opportunities for service nor a unique means of self-realization. For those inherently gifted as teachers and for those basically uncommitted, one training program is hardly likely to be more advantageous than another.

But for the majority, the new program held the promise of introducing the student to the reality of teaching earlier in her college career. Hopefully, some still would be able to shift to other studies if teaching proved uncongenial. More important, the intern consultants would be there to help in the preparation of plans and materials, provide specific suggestions for meeting the day-to-day problems of children, demonstrate approaches to teaching with which the intern might not be familiar or feel confident. Most important of all, the consultant would be available for personal counsel, and the intern might be assisted to make more satisfactory resolutions of the conflicts she would encounter.

It is presently assumed that state certification officials, college faculty, and school placement officers screen out those not fitted for teaching because of emotional as well as other reasons. But the evidence on which those who guard entry into the profession now act is necessarily quite thin. The student's maintenance of a satisfactory academic grade-point average and her completion of a set of required courses are usually the only available criteria for certification despite the well established fact that neither relates consistently to "success" as an elementary school teacher. And the lack of firm relationship holds for a number of different definitions of "success." At least a few studies show that, if anything, grades are negatively correlated with the ratings school principals make of their beginning teachers.[12] Even evidence of neuroticism is not a firm basis for rejection. At least one author has observed that many who are less than adequate in their adult relationships may be quite effective with children.[13]

The new program promised a more relevant criterion: Those responsible for certifying teachers would have available the record of the intern's two years' work with children on which to base their judgments.

For the University a final promise of the new program was its most attractive feature. The relationship with the community colleges and the public school systems called for a new level of cooperation. The schools and Michigan State's College of Education had engaged in many successful joint ventures over the years, of course. But something quite different from the sending of an "expert" by the University or the opening up of the school's classrooms for student teachers was now envisioned. Demands would be made on the pre-interns both by the University and school, and both would participate in their preparation. The interns would be paid employees of the public school but at the same time the University would have a part in directing their practice. The intern consultants would also be employees of the public schools but have a special relationship to the University—and it to them. Clearly, conflicts could arise out of these somewhat ambiguous relationships. Yet the opportunity inherent in the plan outweighed the obvious administrative dangers.

For its part, the University could advance its search for the answers to many vexing questions, including a determination of what concepts and generalizations about teaching and schools are of critical importance in the preparation of teachers. The storehouse of opinion, theory, and fact on which a college of education may draw is almost coextensive with knowledge itself, and the best witness of the difficulties encountered in determining what is of value is the diversity which exists in the substantive offerings (as distinct from course titles) of the 1,200 institutions which now prepare teachers.[14] The test of practice would not resolve the question of what "ought" to be taught potential teachers, of course, but it would at least suggest what might or might not be valued by students who had an immediate opportunity to put their college studies to work. For the University, the opportunity to examine its own offerings in this more realistic setting was the most fundamental reason of all for its enthusiasm for the project.

---

[12] Joseph E. Morsh and Eleanor Wilder, *Identifying the Effective Instructor or: A Review of Quantitative Studies, 1900-1952*, Lackland, Texas: USAF Personnel Training Research Center, 1954.

[13] Percival M. Symonds, "Reflections on Observations of Teachers," *Journal of Educational Research*, 43: 688-696, 1950.

[14] An interesting reflection of the diversity appears in Paul Woodring and John Scanlon (editors), "How Should Teachers Be Educated?—Seven Views," *American Education Today*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963, pp. 239-244.

E. DIFFERENCES AMONG INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

Most of the objectives, just described, characterize many of the other new internship programs. There are, however, differences between these programs and STEP which need to be made explicit even at the risk of overemphasizing their significance.

To begin with, the internship at Michigan State, as initially planned, was to be imbedded in a five-year rather than a fifth-year program. The essential distinction is between programs in which some study of pedagogy extends over the student's undergraduate years and plans in which a short period of formal instruction in education and an internship follows the completion of a four-year liberal arts degree program.

A strong case can be made for the fifth-year plan, especially in the preparation of secondary school teachers, and the majority of the recent internship programs are of this kind. Even for future secondary school teachers, however, one might question the wisdom of delaying actual contact with schools and teaching until after the student has committed his total undergraduate career. On quite selfish grounds, the danger is that many of the most promising candidates may be enticed into other fields in the absence of any reinforcement of their initial desire to teach. More importantly, however, it can be argued that what the future high school teacher chooses to master in the study of his discipline may change if he has a clearer conception of the problems he will face in transmitting his subject to adolescents.

In any case, for prospective elementary school teachers the choice between the fifth- and five-year plan is easier to make. Certification requirements in pedagogy and professionalized liberal arts are more numerous for the elementary teacher and the necessary courses are difficult to include in a single year if an internship is also to be completed. Of course, these practical considerations are persuasive only if it is assumed that existing certification requirements are valid, or at the very least, that they ought not be circumvented whether valid or not.

Other important differences in Michigan State's program followed from an early insistence that the program be such that it could be sustained out of regular revenues once the initial Ford Foundation grant expired. Several implications followed from the decision to use the grant only for developmental nonrecurring costs. For one thing it meant that foundation funds would not be used to underwrite the tuition or salaries of the pre-interns or interns, as in many of the other new programs. The decision also carried with it the requirement that enough students be enrolled so that the proportion of public funds invested in each student would be no greater than in the existing on-campus program. In contrast to many of the other new internship plans, the Michigan State program was designed to be a venture in "mass" education rather than an effort to train an elite group of teachers.

Also following from the decision that the program be self-sustaining, Michigan State's internship was restricted to the preparation of elementary school teachers. The cost of providing off-campus courses in the many disciplines of secondary school teachers was felt to be prohibitive in the absence of continuing special grants. We believe that many of the issues which we shall discuss would arise in the operation of an internship at higher grade levels. But differences in the personality, expectations, and motivations of elementary and secondary teachers would, in the absence of any other considerations, alter the specific form these problems would take. The chief limitation in generalizing from STEP's experience, therefore, is that the program was concerned exclusively with the preparation of elementary teachers.

Changes in the structure of the program became necessary as experience with STEP revealed what was possible as well as what was desirable. The principal change has been a reduction of the internship to a single year, and the reorganization of instruction so that the program could be completed in four calendar years. The reasons for this shift will become apparent as our analysis develops.

In the next chapter we shall discuss the problems encountered in attracting students to the internship program. In our view the difficulties that were overcome say much about the motives students have in choosing to become elementary school teachers and the instructional problems that must be solved in their training. We then follow with an analysis of both the opportunities and limitations that arise when instruction in pedagogy is offered concurrently with the student's practice in a school situation. Next, we examine the intern consultant-intern relationship in considerable detail since we believe that this relationship is the key one. Any predictions about the future of the internship in the preparation of teachers must take into account how this function, or one similar to it in purpose, is most likely to get defined. In this connection, we will also explore the acceptance of the interns by established teachers and the constraints that arise where conflicts between the intern and her milieu are encountered. A short description of the new internship program that became effective in the Fall of 1964 will follow, and we will conclude with a summary assessment of the uses of the internship approach in the education of teachers.

CHAPTER 2

ASSEMBLING A STUDENT BODY

A. ATTRACTING STUDENTS

A reading of the annual reports of other internship programs made it abundantly clear that a first major hurdle in establishing Michigan State's program would be that of "recruiting" a sufficient number of qualified students. For even though many of the earlier programs had offered special inducements—especially tuition grants and fellowships—most had experienced no great rush of applicants.

It seemed ironic that the STEP staff should be so concerned with attracting students at a time when others in the university were frantically devising measures to deal with large annual increases in campus enrollments. Yet, as it turned out, the staff's anxieties were warranted; more was involved than the reluctance of students to enter a new and untried program.

Forewarned by the experience of others, resident coordinators were stationed in the cooperating centers a full year in advance of the transfer of the first class from the community colleges to the university.[1] During this year the coordinators' time was devoted to winning community support for the program, identifying potential students, and establishing a working relationship with members of the school faculties who would supervise the practice of the pre-interns.

---

[1] In one center the local school leadership advanced the date for the enrollment of its first class and recruited the students itself before the resident coordinator was appointed.

Community support was anticipated since the introduction of the program into a particular school system depended on its prior acceptance by the superintendent, board members, and the community college dean. Superintendents at all fearful of their community's reception of the innovation, of course, declined the invitation to participate. Moreover, a unanimous approval by each local board was sought, and where even a minority questioned the wisdom of affiliating, the University withdrew its invitation.

As a result of this self-selection, a favorable reception in the communities was virtually assured. School leaders opened many doors for the coordinators and a heavy schedule of speeches to civic organizations, teacher groups, and potential students was arranged in each center. The local press, radio, and TV gave generous amounts of space or time to descriptions of the program and some added editorial endorsement.

The reception accorded the coordinators and the pace they set for themselves is reflected in this passage from an early interview with one of the coordinators. We had asked how the project was being received by the "shapers of opinion" like the newspapers:

> I'll take issue on whether newspapers are shapers of public opinion, but I will say they've been wonderful to me. In fact, the Education Editor called me just last Saturday and wanted to do another story. So we scheduled one for the lull between the big issue on the opening of school and the opening of the community college. They have been wonderful. There've been a couple of Sunday spreads and this one coming up and he talked about four stories during this coming year, to keep interest high. Radio I've tried—they aren't too interested in anything right now. But they want me on a program they have on education. They want to do a taped show sometime after the interns are in the schools. Then I received an invitation from the ACE—that's the Association for Childhood Education—which is mainly a teacher's organization but not a school organization as such, and they provided a scholarship which we are going to make available. I've made the rounds of the service organizations, too, like the Exchange Club. There's one club that meets in the morning at 7 a.m. and I got invited to that to speak. My God, I can't even see at that time in the morning, let alone speak. I don't know what I said, but I thought of something. They are interested in it, though maybe not as interested as they are in having a speaker. The thing snowballs—everyone wants to get on the bandwagon.

The other coordinators described equally strenuous campaigns to inform their own communities and reported equally favorable receptions One, for example, gave 24 formal speeches in a ten-week period. With but one notable exception, the organized civic groups were interested where they were not enthusiastic. Some offered scholarships and many put potential students in touch with the coordinators. The one exception to this general support came from among the ranks of established teachers. At a later point in the discussion we shall comment on the teacher's mixed emotions about the program at greater length. Here it is sufficient to say that it seems unlikely that opposition among teachers materially affected enrollments. The number of students whom teachers may have dissuaded from applying was probably no greater than the number that other teachers encouraged to enroll.

In later years the coordinators found it necessary to continue active information and recruiting campaigns, though not with the same intensity as in the first year. The result of their work is summarized in the following record of new enrollments:

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENTERING THE STEP PROGRAM

Center:	Year:				
	1960	1961	1962	1963	Totals
A	0	14	9	10	33
B	0	13	8	16	37
B	0	16	24	56	96
D	19	26	52	44	141
E	19	13	17	20	69
F	0	15	14	16	45
Totals	38	97	124	162	421

The size of the enrollment can be evaluated in two different ways. We can, first of all, judge it against the staff's own objective of achieving a "self-sustaining" program. It was estimated that an entering class of 20 new students in each center each year would make a center's program self-sustaining in its third year of operations. This estimate provided for some dropouts in the course of training, and for a level of tax support no greater than that given the on-campus student.

By this standard, two of the six centers have substantially exceeded expectations, three others have approached or appear likely to achieve a "break-even" enrollment. The program in the sixth center was withdrawn as of Fall, 1964.

In part, the differences among centers resulted from quite obvious factors like the size of the student body at the respective community colleges. But equally as important was the proximity of other teacher-training institutions; the two most flourishing centers were hubs of urban regions where four-year colleges have been established recently. It is too early to determine what effect this will eventually have on enrollments; the local school men feel that it will not have any appreciable effect.

While enrollments have been uneven among the centers, the steady increase in the total number enrolled over all centers does suggest that stability will be achieved by the time the funds provided by the Ford Foundation grant are exhausted. Judged then, against this self-imposed requirement, Michigan State University has succeeded in establishing its program on a "mass" footing. An expansion of the program to two new areas should be accomplished in 1965.

But the enrollments were achieved at a considerable cost in the time and energy of the coordinators and those they enlisted to aid them in "recruitment." It is against this second standard that a different judgment must be made.

For the coordinators, the enrollment of students proved to be a matter of continuing concern. The very fact that they have had to "sell" a program whose advantages seemed self-evident to them has been a source of much frustration. The coordinators were experienced school men and teacher-educators. They felt challenged to help build a more meaningful program of teacher education. All had balanced the personal disadvantages of a partial separation from the campus community against an opportunity to enhance their own teaching. Not surprisingly, though in different degrees, all found the role of a "recruiter" irksome. One coordinator expressed the attitude that his colleagues shared:

> I guess the one thing I would really like to get rid of is this recruiting business. This leaves me cold. I was never a salesman and I'd rather pay somebody than go out and knock on doors. If it gets to the point where I have to really Indian wrestle somebody into the program I don't care about it; it's not worth it to me. Well, I know to get this going you have to do these things, but I hope as time goes on that we no longer have to engage in these duties. If *not*. . . . I'm looking forward to teaching next year because that's the more creative aspect of the program. I welcome an opportunity to get into something where nobody can say you are wrong because they don't know, and I don't know what's the best way to go. I enjoy it when you've got a situation where if something doesn't work you can change it. Maybe after a while this program will get cut and dried too and the expectations are going to be there and pretty tough to change. But during this first two or three years there is going to be a real adventure. . . .

A certain initial resistance to an untried educational venture was expected and there was less necessity for a "hard sell" after the first classes in each center were formed, and especially after the first interns were in their classrooms. It then was possible to refer interested students to the interns themselves for the answers to their questions. And in two centers at least, the rise in the number of applicants made a "hard sell" unnecessary.

Even so, the difficulties that MSU's coordinators encountered and the parallel problems that other institutions have had in attracting students cannot be charged simply to the newness of the internship idea. Nor, as our opening description of the coordinators' intensive information campaigns was intended to demonstrate, can the difficulties be attributed to any lack of publicity, or community support. But neither, in our view, do the difficulties encountered in enlisting students mean that the enthusiasm of those sponsoring the internship is misplaced.

Judging by the coordinators' experiences, the "selling" turned as much on the need to convince students that a career as an elementary school teacher was desirable as it did convincing them of the advantages of an internship. The point was made by one of the coordinators:

> I look at the group we have each time [this was in the third year of the project at his center], and about fifty percent are those that have never thought of elementary education. The students have to be introduced to elementary education as a field. The more I think about it, this is a more crucial problem than recruiting for STEP. It's a little like the salesman who looks at his wares and says it's not selling—why? And it's not because of the program because it's built for the student all the way along the line. Then it must be something else, and I think it's the fact that they just don't see elementary teaching plus the desire to go away to campus. . . .

The problems that Michigan State University, and others, have encountered in attracting students to the new internship programs stem largely, we believe, from the way students assess a career in elementary teaching. To support this assertion we must describe the motivations of the students who did enroll.

B. THE STUDENTS ATTRACTED

Four main types of students have enrolled in Michigan State's internship program. The largest group are young women not very different from their on-campus counterparts except in their socio-economic backgrounds. For example, according to the STEP students' own report, their parents' annual income was about half that of otherwise comparable on-campus students.[2] About half of the young women in this first group told us that they would probably have tried to become teachers even if STEP had not become available in their communities, but the majority of these said that they would have had to interrupt their college training to earn enough money to transfer to a four-year school. Many could not have financed the studies that preceded the internship had not NDEA grants and other special loan funds become available.

---

[2] See Appendix A.

A second, but smaller, group of young women differed from the first group only in that they did not come from socially disadvantaged backgrounds; they could have financed a transfer to a four-year school. But for each of these women some reason made it desirable that they remain in their home communities: some were engaged to be married and did not wish to be separated from their fiances; some felt they had, or actually did have, special obligations to their families; and a few had parents who welcomed the STEP plan as a means of keeping their daughters at home. Girls in this second group sometimes left the program and remained on-campus after their first summer session. A romance, or some less obvious attraction of campus life, proved more powerful than whatever had originally led them to choose the internship program. From our interviews we know that many of the girls in the first group, too, would have preferred to remain on campus. But the economic facts of their lives gave them no real choice.

A third group of enrollees consisted of "older" married or widowed women with diverse social backgrounds and previous work experience. There are those who believe there exists a large reserve of older women eager to become elementary school teachers. Perhaps this is so. Our own experience suggests that if many women have the desire, it usually is not strong enough to overcome their reluctance to undertake a rigorous training program. The cost for the older women was not so much financial—though many who expressed an initial interest did not enroll because of economic reasons—as it was emotional. Many feared the disruption of family life or the sacrifice of other social obligations. In order for a married woman to seriously contemplate entering the program, she had to have either an over-riding economic reason—recent widowhood or divorce and young children to support, for example—or an extremely cooperative husband and family. Even those who did enroll told us later that they had had to overcome guilt feelings—a concern that they might be neglecting their own children for the children of others.

Of the many "older" women who originally made inquiries about the program, most decided that the demands were too stringent, and two who came to campus for the first summer session found the separation from their families too depressing and withdrew. The "older" women who did persist were among the most committed of all those who enrolled and, in the judgment of their building principals and the intern consultants, among the most effective teachers prepared by STEP. But those who see a solution to teacher shortages in the training of women whose own children are grown, exaggerate the numbers who are willing to sacrifice other interests in order to qualify under existing standards.

Finally, a group of men enrolled in the new program. Their proportion among the STEP enrollees turned out to be much higher (23 percent) than in the comparable on-campus program (6 percent). Few of these men had ever thought of becoming elementary school teachers prior to learning about STEP, though about half had considered high school teaching. Their reasons for joining the program were as varied as their ages and backgrounds. Most made it clear that it was the opportunity to earn a college degree—any college degree—that was decisive. Since other means of achieving this objective were blocked for financial or other reasons, they settled for STEP and elementary school teaching. But there were some who left promising beginnings in other careers because they found these fields devoid of social purpose and believed they would find teaching more satisfying. These were offset by men who had failed, judging by their records of past employment, at other work and felt their prospects for achieving security would be greater in elementary school teaching. The men were a mixed lot about whom it is difficult to generalize.

If allowances are made for the oversimplification of our four-way classification, these were the students who choose to enroll in the internship program. Overall they differed in three major ways from students in the on-campus elementary education program: they came from relatively disadvantaged backgrounds, there were a greater proportion of "older" married women among them, and there were relatively more men. On these same three counts they more closely resembled beginning teachers nationally than do Michigan State's on-campus students. We discerned no statistically significant differences between the campus and internship students either in academic ability or achievement. Nor, once differences in socio-economic background and age were taken into account, could we discover reliable differences on any of a number of interest and personality measures.[3]

The important point—and this is the purpose of our gross characterization of the STEP students—is that the quality of the internship program itself, whether for good or ill, was not a major factor in the student's decision to enter it. Many students, it is true, and especially the older men and women, told us that they did find the work-study aspect of the program an added inducement. But only the relatively few women in our second group, and an even smaller number of the men, had any real choice in the matter. For the majority, the convenience of attending classes in their home community and the financial advantages of STEP made the program attractive.

---

[3] The data on which these assertions are based is summarized in Appendix A.

This point was put more emphatically by the coordinator who told us:

> It's almost a miracle that we got out our [first] class. If the financial necessity had not been there we wouldn't have made it. A large number of these students [in the community college] really don't know much of anything about colleges and universities or job requirements—and not just those for teaching. Their parents can't help much. Ninety percent of them never went beyond high school and quite a number never went through high school. The students are at the community college taking courses which will get them to the point where they can transfer somewhere else for something, someday—you know, a real open-ended kind of thing. So they haven't got anything in mind of the kinds of things it is possible for them to do. There is a tremendous prestige in going to the older universities, not just to the University of Michigan but the others too. So the students say they are going to these universities without any regard for their economic circumstances or anything else. And student after student, without a cent to their name, and with no prospect of covering their living expenses even if they got a scholarship, would come in and say: 'What do I do now?' They'd been living in a dream world and they get a sad awakening in the spring of the year. They have to make some decision about transferring. They just can't go! We were faced with the inability to *really* talk to these people until they know that they just can't swing a full campus program. STEP becomes a next best thing, a way out. It's not the preferential type of thing. It's the best possible way out. But there were a large number of youngsters that had to face this same thing prior to this program and in facing it didn't go on with their education at all. And now these kids face it, but now they have an alternative that allows them to do something that is for them the second best thing, rather than the third, fourth, or fifth best thing.

Although the coordinators worked valiantly to assemble each class early in the academic year, they could not know until late in the Spring just how many students would actually transfer from the community college. To be sure, after the first few years greater stability was achieved in some centers as a result of extensive campaigns to inform high school guidance counselors and students of the availability of the program. Eventually this work paid off; students have had longer to arrange financing for their pre-internship year. But even so, the proportion of students who have settled for STEP as a "second best thing" has remained sizable. Among the many persons who have inquired about the program, most of those who had a real choice and no actual or fancied tie to their home community found the appeal of campus social life, the status earned by going away to college, or the desire for freedom from parental restraints more persuasive than the advantages of an internship for their future work as a teacher.

STEP's experiences with campus-based students provided further evidence on this point. Few of these students responded to an invitation to transfer to the internship even though many made inquiries.

More important, though students volunteered their opinion that the internship would correct what they felt were shortcomings in their campus training, especially its "abstractness," most added that they found the non-academic attractions of campus life too potent. Of those campus students who did transfer, few shifted primarily for the possible educational advantages. The opportunity to live at home and save dorm fees usually was the compelling reason.[4]

In their choice of a college, students in other fields are also motivated by what are essentially practical and non-academic considerations.[5] Elementary education students are not unique in this respect. But the phenomenon may be more characteristic among those entering teaching since, typically, the desire to be a teacher is itself not the most important reason motivating students to enter a teacher education program!

Among the students we interviewed, both campus-based and in the internship program, a large number of men and women made it clear that becoming a teacher was a second, or even lower, occupational choice. Especially among the women, parental and peer pressures impelled many to prepare for teaching rather than for the field they themselves would have preferred. Girls we interviewed who had enrolled in more "masculine" fields like engineering, agricultural economics, and the like told us that they had had to overcome serious parental opposition, and, in some instances, had severely strained family ties. But girls who enrolled in a teaching program after having met resistance to their first choice had not been willing to pay this price. Others doubted their ability to succeed in the preferred occupation, or questioned the wisdom of making the effort, given what they felt were the difficulties of combining marriage and motherhood with careers in fields other than teaching. For many of the men, too, teaching was not a first choice, and we noted, as have others, that many saw teaching only as a step in a campaign to become a politician, lawyer, businessman.[6]

Not all students, of course, viewed teaching as a second-choice occupation. But among those who did not, a majority valued the college experience itself more highly than they did the opportunity to become a teacher. College meant status, a way of satisfying intellectual curiosity, or the social and cultural advantages of campus life. They perceived the teacher education program as instrumental in achieving these primary objectives. For many of the STEP students, enrollment in the program was the only way open to a college degree; for others, especially among the campus-based students, the teacher preparatory program was seen as interfering *least* with other objectives.[7]

---

[4] A larger number of campus-based students chose to enter the internship when it was reduced from a five to a four-year program. Even so, financial considerations remain the most potent ones in the students' decision to transfer to the internship program.

[5] Elizabeth Douvan and Carol Kaye, "Motivational Factors in College Entrance," M. Neville Sanford, ed., *The American College*, New York: Wiley & Sons, 1962, pp. 216 f.

[6] Myron Lieberman, *Education as a Profession*, Englewood, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1956, presents an unusually thoughtful discussion of the literature on the motivation of students who enter teaching.

There was also a third group of students—not large, and only among the campus-based women—whose interest in *both* college and teaching was minimal. These were mainly girls who were filling the years before marriage and children. They saw college as a means of staying with their age-group or calming their parents concern for status. For these girls, entry into the teaching curriculum was also the least of all evils: some major had to be declared.

Finally, there were students, unfortunately relatively few, who valued teaching for its own sake. These were students who would have prepared for teaching even had they been forced to choose between earning a college degree or a teaching certificate. Obviously, they wanted both, but becoming a teacher was most prized. Many of these students had overcome formidable obstacles in order to enroll. Others had made a series of decisions over a long period of time, each of which had made the eventual choice of teaching seem more inevitable. For example, such a student may have begun by finding her own teachers admirable and worthy of imitation; may have written her high school vocational themes on teaching; may have taken jobs as a camp counselor, Sunday school teacher, or youth group leader; may have tried and rejected other jobs as a secretary, clerk, or salesgirl, and may have rejected early opportunities for marriage. These students were oriented towards work; they were more likely to have thought through the problems they would face in combining teaching and marriage; and they planned to attempt the combination even if no economic necessity required it.

Of these four groups—and we recognize the oversimplification of our typology—only the last, given a truly free choice, had reason to prefer an internship program on its merits. For one thing, they could begin teaching sooner. For another, if the internship lived up to the claims made for it, they might become more effective teachers.

Thus, the new internship programs in teacher education are in the position of increasing training requirements for an occupation that is especially attractive to uncommitted students. In STEP's case, the student had to submit to an extended and closely supervised induction and leave the college campus for this purpose. If STEP has reached its enrollment goals, it is not because there are large numbers of students willing to meet added demands in the hope that they will become more effective teachers. Rather STEP's relative success demonstrates only that there are many potential college students who do not yet have ready access to a college campus. The practices of other internship programs—especially that of underwriting enrollments with scholarships and fellowships—suggest that Michigan State University's experience is not exceptional. If for no other reason, STEP, and the other new programs, could be justified on the grounds that they have made college and teaching careers available to many students who might otherwise have had to forego them.

---

[7] Douvan and Kaye, *op. cit.*, p. 200f., discusses more fully the lack of saliency of occupational motives in the girls' decision to go to college.

But the advocacy of an internship for teachers cannot rest comfortably on the argument that it is responsive to an otherwise unmet social need. Rather, it must be demonstrated that the internship provides a sound alternative to existing methods of preparing teachers, and especially that initially uncommitted students become so, or that they are effectively discouraged from continuing in training.

C. WHAT HAPPENED TO THE STUDENTS?

One argument for initiating the STEP program was that students would have an early opportunity to decide if teaching was a suitable occupation. Additionally, the University hoped it would have more relevant grounds on which to recommend or withhold certification. An examination of the causes of withdrawal from the program—both voluntary and by request—is pertinent in evaluating the warranty of these original expectations.

Of the 421 students enrolled in Michigan State's internship program up to the summer of 1964, eighty-six or slightly more than twenty per cent, have either been asked to leave or have done so voluntarily. This percentage is considerably higher than that among campus-based students who attain junior class standing in elementary education. In our comparison sample, only six percent of the students left school before being graduated. Compared with national statistics for graduates who never teach, or who leave teaching after a single year in the classroom, however, the withdrawal rate from STEP has not been inordinately high.[8]

Of the 86 students who left, 30 did so involuntarily. This number is a minimum estimate of those who failed to meet standards, since some of those who withdrew voluntarily anticipated an unfavorable assessment of their performance. Students were asked to leave either for failing to maintain an adequate grade point average (11 students) or for unacceptable performance in their teaching assignments (19 students). Thus, to date, unsatisfactory teaching has accounted for nearly twice as many involuntary withdrawals as has poor scholarship, and this disparity is all the more noteworthy since among those who enrolled in the first classes, some individuals were known to be poor risks as students. In the more recent classes, marginal students have been counseled into other occupations, and failure in academic courses has become a negligible factor. The internship students' grades compare favorably with those earned by on-campus students, although a comparison is not entirely appropriate since the effect on grades of the internship students' exclusive attendance in summer and extension courses is difficult to evaluate.

---

[8] NEA statistics as reported in the *NEA Research Bulletin* suggest that in recent years about 17% of those who complete training in elementary education do not take positions in schools.

Failures among campus-based students during their student-teaching term run at a rate of about one percent. This suggests either that the standards applied to evaluate the classroom performance of the STEP pre-interns are more severe, or that the campus student-teachers are better prepared. The first reason is, we believe, the correct one. In the absence of other information, the inclination is to resolve doubts in favor of the marginal campus student-teacher. But in the internship program, not only is more information always available, but permission to begin the internship is tantamount to hiring a classroom teacher for a particular school system. Where doubts have arisen about a pre-intern's potential for growth, the balance has been tipped against the student. The greater rigor of the standards applied in STEP is illustrated by the staff's decision to permit some students to transfer to the campus program even though their work in the schools as pre-interns was deemed unsatisfactory. In each of the six instances where this occurred, the staff felt that the students had performed at levels which probably would have been acceptable for a regular student-teacher, but in each case the pre-intern was thought to be too immature to assume the responsibilities of a teacher.

The internship program, then, did provide the University with more information on which to base its recommendations for certification. The maintenance of an adequate grade-point average remained a necessary, but no longer a sufficient condition.

It is not so clear, however, that students who found teaching unsuitable withdrew or transferred to other fields; only one student explicitly gave this as her reason for leaving the program. Typically, more than one cause was involved in a student's decision to leave the program. But a judgment as to the principal explanation produced the following classification:

Principal Reason for Voluntary Withdrawal:	Number
Marriage and/or Pregnancy	16
Transfer to a campus program	15
Illness	11
Family moved from STEP center	4
Took teaching job elsewhere	4
Concern for own family and children	2
Lack of finances	2
Dislike of teaching	1
Not established	1
	56

Of those who transferred to campus, all but two continued preparing to become teachers. For others, the decision to leave the internship program represented either a desire for the wider social opportunities of the campus or disaffection with the internship program itself, rather than a shift in occupational goals.

A greater percentage of the STEP students married in the course of training than did campus-based students, and marriage is likely to be more frequent, we believe, whenever instruction is moved off-campus; if nothing else, eligible males are likely to be employed.[10] Thus, many of the STEP students faced not only the need to adjust to their new responsibilities as teachers, but also to the demands of a new marriage. Some students felt the added demands were too great and elected to leave the program.

But not all of those who married in the course of training withdrew, and even some of those who became pregnant returned as soon as local school policy permitted them to do so. Correlating turnover among teachers, or dropouts from STEP, with marriage and child rearing may be misleading. Our feeling is, rather, that marriage or pregnancy was sometimes offered as a socially acceptable reason for withdrawing from the program; a reason which made it unnecessary for the student to admit dissatisfaction either with teaching itself, or the training program.

Similarly, many of those who gave other reasons for leaving probably found teaching uncongenial. But they apparently found it appropriate to supply socially acceptable reasons for doing so—either in an effort to be kind to the project staff, or to protect their own self-esteem.

Whatever the actual motivations may have been, it is important that withdrawals occurred at about a rate equal to that of students who certify but never teach. What is different is that the withdrawals took place *before*, rather than *after* the student was certified.

---

[9] Only two students in our campus comparison sample married before completing their training. Both left college.

At the very least the internship program reduced the social waste involved in preparing students for positions they will not fill.

Assuming, as we do, that the withdrawals represent a screening of the uncommitted, it does not necessarily follow, of course, that those who remained were, or became, committed to teaching careers. To explore the impact of the internship program on the students who remained, we turn next to an examination of the problems that arose in the instruction of the pre-interns.

CHAPTER 3

UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTION IN A SCHOOL SETTING

Problems of the Pre-Internship

A. THE INITIAL PROGRAMS

The internship program described in the opening chapter was, after all, no more than skeleton. It was necessary to flesh it out: to decide what would be taught in the "formal" classes and how the concurrent school experience would be utilized. During STEP's first year the resident coordinators and an on-campus faculty committee met to translate the broad specifications of the original structure into operational terms.

The committee decided to avoid the issue that seemingly plagues so many who seek to define a teacher preparation curriculum—that of determining the characteristics of the teacher it seeks to train. Curriculum planning committees in teacher education often spend months in an effort to define the competencies of the "good" teacher. Unfortunately these definitions lead either to abstractions on which committee members with the most diverse conceptions can agree, to operationally defined but often trivial lists of competencies, or to the imposition of a definition by the more determined and persuasive members of the committee.[1]

---

[1] Cf. *"Who's A Good Teacher?,"* Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1961. The conclusion in this report appears to be that there are no criteria that can be agreed upon.

The effort to establish operational criteria is reasonable enough; if no objectives of training can be stated, the legitimacy of a training program is questionable. But, unfortunately, whether the result is a list of abstractions, a list of competencies, or the imposition of a single definition, *necessary* practical implications for course development seldom seem to follow. Little help is provided for the decisions that must be made: what specifically should be taught; how should it be taught; when should it be taught. Within the range of available alternatives, there is little evidence that one combination of courses and other experiences are more or less likely to produce a teacher with a given set of competencies or one who meets some *a priori* definition of the "good" teacher.[2]

In the absence of convincing evidence that any one set of courses is more relevant to "success" as an elementary school teacher than any other combination—and, even more, in the absence of any agreement on what "success" in teaching is—the committee decided to develop alternative programs for each of the six centers. The committee attempted to take advantage of special situations in each of the communities and the unique strengths of each resident coordinator. It hoped that in the first several years of operation the imperatives for instruction, if any such existed, would be sorted out and the essential requirements for a program in the new setting eventually would become apparent.

It is unnecessary to describe in any great detail the six initial program variations, but it may be useful to point out some of the major differences so that the reader may judge the range from which a final selection was made. One dimension on which the original plans differed had to do with the relative emphasis given to each of the four principal components of any teacher preparation program. While there is little agreement as to what each of these four components should include specifically, there is consensus that a program in teacher education ought to involve study in the liberal arts, in the psychological and social foundations of education, in teaching methods, plus some practical experience in teaching. Disagreement among teacher-educators occurs when they attempt to delineate substance for each of these components, what weight each shall have, and in what sequence they shall be studied.

With six centers available, the STEP planning group thought it wise to vary the substance, weight, and sequence of the four essential components. In one center, for example, increased attention was given to the study of educational and child psychology. In this center, no formal study in teaching methods was contemplated. Instead, the committee hoped that these topics would be introduced informally by the supervising teachers and consultants who would direct the practice in the schools. Conversely, in another center, increased attention was placed on the formal study of teaching methods. In this center, courses not usually included in the undergraduate program at Michigan State University were added—a course in the use and preparation of audio-visual materials, and one in the diagnosis of reading difficulties, for example. In still a third center, the planning group proposed extended study of the community under the direction of an urban sociologist, while in a fourth, it projected additional work in English grammar and literature.

---

[2] The Barr reviews of research on teacher effectiveness are germane. Even making allowances for the primitiveness of much of the research reviewed, the overriding conclusion is that few, if any, stable relationships have been demonstrated.

Sequence also varied in the six original plans. In one center, work in psychology and sociology preceded practice in the schools and the formal study of pedagogy; in another it was offered concurrently with the pre-interns practice; and in a third the serious study of the foundation fields accompanied the internship itself.

Considerable attention was also given to varying the conditions of the student's experience in the schools. Some programs assigned the pre-interns to a single teacher for half a day every day; in others, the student was directed by the building principal. The length of time the pre-interns spent in the schools also varied, as well as the number and kinds of schools to which they were assigned.

With so many possible combinations possible and with only six centers, no systematic rotation was feasible, of course. But, in any case, the staff was not concerned to discover which of the possible combinations was "best." Rather the purpose was to increase initial differences among the centers within the limits set by the overall structure. If common problems arose when instruction was taken off the college campus into a school-related environment, such problems would be perceived with greater clarity if an initial diversity in programs was encouraged. In this way a basis would exist for concluding that a given instructional problem was inherent in the movement of instruction off-campus. And, despite the many center differences, common problems did arise and the attempt to resolve them eventually led to the development of a more uniform program for all centers.

B. THE EFFECTS OF THE REMOVAL OF CAMPUS CONSTRAINTS ON INSTRUCTION

There is a popular theory that education courses are what they are because of a conspiracy of the "educationists." According to this conventional wisdom, the instructors of courses in pedagogy are engaged in a devious plot to subvert the purposes of a university;

"educationists" are charged with "brainwashing" or offering "busywork" or both. Their purpose in doing so is supposed to be that of tying students to themselves in a dependency relationship which will protect the "educationist's" control of teacher education.

Satisfying as this theory may be to those naive enough to believe it, the situation is really quite different. Every college instructor, including the "educationist," is limited by constraints that relate to the nature of his students and the cultural setting in which the students study, as well as by the instructor's definition of his purposes.

The teacher-in-training on a college campus is first of all a "student," which is to say that her motivation and perception are primarily influenced by her identification with the campus culture and only secondarily by an identification with the profession she is preparing to enter. We have already suggested the importance students preparing to teach attach to the campus experience itself and the relatively lesser value they assign to becoming a "teacher." Students for whom this description is valid will assess their professional education instructors and courses in the same way they do their "non-professional" instructors and courses. For the campus teacher-in-training, as for any other student, the immediate end in sight in any course is likely to be either the maintenance of a respectable (or at least a minimum) grade point average, or the examination of ideas for their own sake. Lacking any first-hand experience as a teacher, she can at best only dimly perceive the relevancy of these grades and ideas to the future demands of the occupation.

There is nothing particularly invidious in either the student's desire for grades or for intellectual stimulation for its own sake. But both motivations can be barriers to success for the college instructor who is sensitizing students to issues they will face as professionals, or developing the skills they will need as teachers.

The barriers are more obvious where students are primarily concerned with the practical matter of earning a grade. Even when the campus student is committed to teaching, the realities of her situation as a student make motives other than that of earning a grade difficult to satisfy. The campus student has few opportunities to test the worth of the instructor's ideas or assignments (and, of course, a test would entail more than an end-of-term examination). She must accept, or appear to accept what she is offered on faith.

As a result, the instructor in education can find himself resorting to "brainwashing" and/or engaging his students in "busywork." Students complete what, for them, are relatively meaningless exercises: writing lesson plans that cannot be taught; "teaching" science to classmates who may know more science than they themselves do;

and in general, finding answers to problems which do not exist for the student—however real they may be to the instructor. Not until the student reaches her student-teaching term, usually in her senior year, does the purpose of what she has been asked to do become clear, if then. Skinner's *bon mot*, made in a different connection, becomes relevant here. In France, says Skinner, when a young man asks for the salt correctly in French he gets the salt; in the U. S. he gets an "A".[3] The situation may be different for students preparing for other fields of work: the future historian writes historical essays as an undergraduate; the future chemist performs chemical analyses. But in teacher education the essential task is that of discovering the instructors' idiosyncracies rather than testing the worth of the ideas, concepts, and practices that they recommend. It is ironic but understandable that beginning elementary teachers, asked to specify the areas of further study they need most, regularly mention courses in teaching methods.[4] This, despite the fact that so much of their undergraduate professional training has focused precisely on the methods and materials of instruction!

The difficulties for the instructor are less obvious, but nonetheless real, if his students are primarily interested in examining ideas for their own sake, and not necessarily for the contribution they might make to his future practice as a teacher. The fact that the campus folklore consigns education courses near the bottom of the intellectual pecking order—with or without justification—does not help matters: the instructor in pedagogy must spend much of his time convincing his students that the ideas he asks them to examine are worthy of study. But even given good will on the part of the student, an important bar exists to the intellectual analysis of teaching. The instructor in education, if he is conscientious, finds that he must spend much time in describing the school as it is before analysis can be fruitful. This necessity arises because the student is confident that he does, in fact, already know what children and schools are like—he has, after all, been both a child and a pupil. In describing schools, the instructor finds it necessary to steer a careful course between magnifying "problems" out of all proportion to their importance in order to shock students into considering them seriously or of reinforcing the typical student's naive and essentially sentimental conceptions of teaching and teachers. Unless this heavy descriptive load is undertaken, campus discussions of educational issues are difficult to distinguish from those which the student encounters in his liberal arts courses and, moreover, will often appear to be redundant and oversimplified versions. To illustrate: a discussion of the ramifications of various theories of "democracy" for school practice may easily turn into an inferior review of the student's prior political science courses unless the instructor spends much of his limited class time on developing the circumstances in which one's definition of "democracy" may become a central issue in a school. Yet if time is given to the descriptive task, the instructor faces the charge that he is creating a "mickey mouse" course.

---

[3] B. F. Skinner, *Science and Human Behavior*, New York: Macmillan, 1953.

[4] *Florida Study of Teacher Education*, Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Teacher Education Advisory Council, 1958.

The constraints on the campus instructor in education derive, then, from the fact that the student is indeed a "student," divorced from an adequate opportunity to acquire an understanding of the essential problems of the occupation for which he seeks to prepare or an opportunity to test the worth of what is presented to him. When the students—as in the STEP pre-internship—are separated from the campus and immersed in the culture of the school, a dramatic shift occurs. (It is worth noting, in passing, that a phenomenon similar to the one we are about to describe occurs among students who return to campus after their term of student teaching. Many find that their studies now have purpose, and others report finding the demands of campus life unreal and leave the campus to complete their degrees during the summers.)

As pre-interns, the STEP students identified early with the school situations to which they were assigned. Problems were now brought into the "formal" class by the students as well as by the instructor, and as a result, an opportunity for a more vital exchange between student and instructor became possible. (It was, we hasten to add, only an "opportunity." Not all instructors could take advantage of their new freedom.)

Specific illustrations of the change which could occur can be drawn from our interviews with the pre-interns' instructors. These instructors had all taught on campus, and some were offering the same course simultaneously to the pre-interns, and to students in the on-campus program.

The need to identify "problems" for students in the pre-internship diminished and was described this way by a science methods instructor:

> The biggest thing that is different is that you don't have to get the students to see what children are like in a classroom, how adults work with youngsters, how they gear their presentations to the youngsters at differing grade levels. This is my biggest problem on campus, and this is one thing I had no trouble with at all with the STEP kids. For me this was the biggest strength of the program. For example, one of the biggest things I have to do on campus is to try and help the student understand the difference between talking at the pupils' level and talking down to them. They have difficulty believing that youngsters, no matter how young, can put some pretty serious and difficult questions so far as the whys of scientific phenomena are con-

> cerned. I didn't even have to mention this here, because it came from these kids themselves. They (the students) would come to me and tell me that their pupils were asking these questions, and that they didn't know the answers, and what should they do? Then there was the business of having to contrive a school situation as we do on campus. Even if we can get a group of pupils to come to visit on campus it's an artificial stiuation at best. Don't misunderstand me. The thing is not that the STEP students don't overshoot their pupils, but they *knew* they were doing it, and they wanted my help in handling it.

This passage touches on a further difficulty that the campus-based instructor meets as he attempts to describe the reality of the school. Many of the generalizations that a student preparing to teach in elementary school is asked to consider seem to be truisms on one level, hardly worthy of college-level study. The example above, that one should speak *to* children but not *down to* them, is a readily acceptable and hardly a complex proposition. Similarly, the generalization that the range of individual differences among children can be great even in the so-called homogeneously grouped classroom is seemingly so obvious that one is led to ask why students competent enough to be admitted to college would need to explore its ramifications. And, indeed, if only the verbalization of such generalizations were required of elementary teachers, one would have to admit that they *are* too simple to justify a college student's time. But—and this is the point—it is one thing to state these generalizations and it is something else again to know how to apply these rather simple formulations in the classroom situation. How, for example, does one use language that can be understood by the child who asks why a dart shot into water appears to bend, without either dismissing the child's question or oversimplifying the answer to the point of misinforming the child? How does one cope with the obvious differences among twenty-five children in their readiness to learn number concepts and still maintain a class organization? An actual attempt to teach, and perhaps a failure or two, is required before the teacher-to-be is prepared to acknowledge that there may be something worth examining both in the familiar subjects of the elementary school curriculum, and in methods of communicating these ideas to youngsters. Often it turns out that the generalizations themselves have not really been understood and, when this is realized, the future teacher may come to view his academic studies and his education courses in quite a new light.

Not only does the student's notion of the worth of studying the teaching process and the substance of the lower school curriculum change once he moves off campus, but his readiness to attack questions that involve the purposes of schools may be increased as well. This point was made by a second instructor:

My assignments were much the same as I would have made on campus, except that there were more of them. But the "more" was in response to their questions. At first we'd get such things as "Well, it's nice to talk about a democratic classroom, but I've never seen one . . . " Then they might say that maybe it was a good idea "but the building I'm in doesn't work like that." Then we would raise questions about how they could make changes in their classrooms or buildings and some of them became aware that the teachers were putting more limits on what they did than they really needed to. They came to see this quite differently.

This is the first time I've ever taught where I could actually see growth in the kinds of things the students observe about school-community relationships, for example. Every student had attended the parent-teacher conferences and the PTA meetings. At first I'd ask if the parents were involved in the work of ther schools . . . and they'd say "Yah, they have so many people coming, the participation is real good." Then we'd begin to get comments like "Well, they're just coming. They sit and listen and they're not really involved." Then they began to try and figure out why they weren't. They reached the conclusion that only when the parents felt their own children were directly affected did the parent connect up with the work of the school. So they became more perceptive of the role of the teacher, and of the school in promoting this sort of thing.

Now I think the kind of development that took place is different than what you'd have with a beginning teacher. This is a guess, but I would say this because these students had some place to come to and react openly . . . we kept having to reassure them that the kinds of things they were saying weren't going any farther. We had a couple of students who may have been over-critical. I can talk about PTA's on campus, of course, but the only kind the kids will have seen are the good shiny-faced middle-class PTA's. I can talk about leadership roles on campus, but out here you can see a teacher who is very influential in the decision-making in a particular building. You see the principal leaning on the informal organization or fighting it and what happens. It seems we assume quite blandly on campus that the students know what people are like, what kids are like, but they don't know.

What distinguished formal instruction in the pre-internship setting, then, was that the student acquired sufficient background as a result of her work in the school to make it possible for intellectual analysis to go beyond the superficial. The student, made aware of the complexities involved in what had formerly appeared to be simple problems, was less likely to be satisfied with simple answers.

As we have suggested, on campus the instructor must often resort to prescription-giving (and his students are hardly in a position to challenge him); in the pre-internship setting, the situation was evidently somewhat different:

. . . we went so deep so fast that it was startling at times. Once one of the students brought up a behavior problem, a real case she had observed, as an example for a point I was making. On campus I would have responded with a cliche like "Well, you want to start out strict in the fall." But here one of the other students knew the family and said that kid was behaving as he had to, that he was in an impossible situation. We'd almost always wind up discarding pat answers. In a way that ruined the usual tests . . . certainly the use of objective tests. It's difficult to write test items if there aren't any right answers. Our answers always turned out to be "it depends . . ." "Maybe but . . ." "The theories work if properly applied, but the application depends on so many factors . . ."

The enrichment of the student's background was supplemented with actual demonstrations. When instruction shifted to the centers, many of the neat little packages of the campus curriculum came untied, and instruction did not have to be fitted to a factory-like schedule. The STEP instructors, both those living in the centers and those commuting from campus, emphasized their greater freedom to take advantage of unanticipated opportunities. As one put it: "These students weren't pegged into so many slots so that you had to adjust a number of other slots if you wanted to change something." Schedules could be, and were, rearranged. Trips to special school situations—an ungraded primary, a school for the blind, and the like—could be carried out with a minimum of effort. Especially after the first group of interns were at work, it became relatively easy to arrange special demonstrations for the benefit of the pre-interns. The center offices and classrooms were located in old school buildings and an individual child or a group of children could be brought into the STEP classroom on very short notice; sometimes nothing more was involved than walking the children down a corridor. The instructors differed in making use of this greater flexibility, but those who wished to do so could arrange such experiences without the trauma that accompanies the attempt to provide "reality" on campus.

If such experiences as we have just described are valued, they also can be provided in the typical campus program—though with considerably more difficulty. But there is also a difference in what the campus and pre-internship student react to when they are involved in field observations and demonstrations. The campus student, especially if her contacts with schools are infrequent, is as likely to react to the charm of the children as to the operations of the teacher being observed. The experience may be important in reinforcing the student's desire to become a teacher but is probably less important in demonstrating the generalizations an instructor is attempting to develop. The pre-intern, for whom contact with children in schools was a daily occurrence, utilized such experiences directly and more fruitfully in her consideration of critical issues.

In the pre-internship setting the controls needed to keep the campus student at her task, especially the threat of grades, also became relatively less important. Complaints about "busywork" were not completely eliminated, but the basis for this charge shifted:

> One of the delightful things here, when it occurs, is that you have more assurance when you make an assignment that the kids can use and try out, that it will be done. If they are asked to make something, a teaching aid for example, it isn't just a game. If they do find it useful this comes out in a very obvious and spontaneous way. And if they don't find it useful they are pretty frank about it too. On campus there is a facade that makes it difficult to know what your students are really thinking. The verbalizer is not so much at an advantage here, and the task-oriented student can show up a bit better.

Or again,

> The campus people do have the threat of grades. This faces them the minute they sign up for a course. On campus I usually have to alleviate these fears and say "Now don't panic and just work for a grade." With these people it was just the reverse, I had to convince them that some attention to grades was important. As we got into the subject I think STEP students had a greater depth of understanding as to the function of science in a classroom than would a comparable on-campus group. I gave them a final exam I also used on campus, and the STEP kids did a much better job in comparison; that is my impression. They didn't do as well with the fact and content but they were much more realistic in seeing ways in which these could be taught . . . One funny thing was that the students were confused as to what "course" they were taking with me. This came out at the very last session when I was explaining the grades and so on. Someone asked, "Oh, you mean this is the science methods class? I thought we were going to take that on campus!" It just dawned on me that they didn't realize until right at the end that this was their methods course, and I was a bit overwhelmed! But at the same time it was quite enlightening because it explained many of the things that I couldn't understand. We ran the whole gamut of the kinds of things they would bring in to show me. Most of the feedback was on science and yet there was a spreading out to other areas. Like one of the things that came up was how do you teach about gravity—it's pretty abstract. Well, one of the STEP kids picked the idea up and a couple of days later came back with a whole raft of papers. He had had his pupils write a story on the theme of what would happen if gravity was turned off. The class responded not so much to the science content, but what the stories told us about the pupils. This probably was out of my area of competence but it was more realistic because in the elementary school you just don't deal with science as a separate thing set apart from everything else.

Not all of the instructors we spoke to about their experiences in teaching the pre-interns were as enthusiastic as those we have just quoted. Nor did even those instructors who were most favorably impressed with the pre-interns equally approve of all aspects of the new instructional situation. Class sessions proved less predictable and the pre-interns sometimes brought the instructors into areas where the latter were not prepared to go. This was especially likely to be the case if the instructor placed a high value on a sequential development of his subject. One told us, for example, that " . . . they would have a question on division and if you were dealing with addition you couldn't use this as an excuse not to answer their question. They would say, 'But right now I'm up to my neck in division.' On campus these questions wouldn't occur. These students made you very much aware that this was a real situation for them. Maybe too aware."

In part, too, the reluctance of some instructors to take advantage of the potential in the new situation stemmed from the ambiguous demands placed upon them. The instructors felt that they were under some compulsion to use campus assignments and texts. Conflict between procedures appropriate on campus but less so for pre-internship instruction became especially marked for the resident staff. The contact between these instructors and the students was so intimate that it became difficult or impossible to maintain a consistent student-teacher relationship, as this relationship is defined on campus. Thus,

> . . . I don't think I'd like a steady diet of STEP teaching. On campus you get rid of your mistakes; mine stay to plague me. For me this is the biggest difference in the two situations, not the kinds of students. They have more reasons for not getting things done. Like so-and-so called this afternoon and said I can't get this in on time because I'm overloaded in school. This I understand because I was right there beside them in the school too. I could see her side of it. On campus what you don't know . . . you can be a heel by not understanding. Here you're so close you understand the total situation. There's such a thing as knowing too much about your students!

Another resident instructor pointed out that the intimacy made it next to impossible to evaluate the students—at least in the usual ways.

> There's a lot to be said for the anonymity of the campus, you know. You simply know the students so well here that when you start to construct an examination it becomes impossible. You are a close friend to most of them, and suddenly you have to shift roles, and this is very uncomfortable. And just because you do know these people you wonder at the adequacy of your decisions about them. There is a lot of comfort when you know only a little about someone. You can make categorical judgments—bingo, you feel good about your decisions. But here you have half a dozen reasons to explain why someone didn't do well. Then too, in this situation your evaluations take on more importance than they do on campus. It is crucial to them whether they hit it off with you. They can't balance one prof off against another as they do on campus. Here all the students' eggs are in one basket, so to speak. And they're not working just for grades, but they feel their placement as interns will be affected too. Just as you have to switch roles they have to switch from friend to student too. I have to perform the judgmental kind of thing and I don't know how good a job I do on this. But here I have to live with it.

If ambiguity about their roles caused special difficulty for the resident staff, those coming out from campus faced a special hazard that they were unlikely to encounter on campus. The pre-interns spent much of their time together and an *esprit* developed among them. (This was, of course, more true in some centers than others.) A strong feeling of mutual support arose and could defeat any attempt by an instructor to employ competition among the students as a spur, as is so commonly done on campus. The role of each student within the group became so well defined that in each center one or two came to be known as "the scholars," one the "science expert," one "the clown," another the "student everyone helps," and so on. This could present problems, especially for commuting instructors:

> The first thing that struck me when I went out there was that I was the stranger in the group. The students knew each other very, very well. If anybody had asked me before this experience I would have said that that would have been highly desirable But there is a problem . . . In science we constantly run into the problem of fear of the subject and I have some introductory activities to loosen up the students, to get them to enjoy it. These activities work if everyone takes part. But in this case the students knew each other so well that they could communicate their reactions to each other with a glance, a lift of an eyebrow. They looked to certain students to provide the answers. If one certain person said something was right there were a certain number of others who thought it was right if she said it. No discussion. It took me some time to realize how cohesive they were as a group. It shows up in the ways they help each other with the weak ones relying on the strong ones to get them through—too much so for their own good. Then they were very conscious about curve-raising on each other.

The group cohesion in a center could become extremely frustrating for an instructor when the pre-interns (and, later, the interns) decided that a given course was irrelevant, or that the instructor was avoiding their questions, or, for whatever reason, that they would not cooperate. A kind of "boycott" would result; the pre-interns would drag their feet on assignments, refuse to participate in discussions, and in general, make life difficult for the instructor. One incident, involving interns to be sure, illustrates what could happen. Due to a scheduling error an evening course had been arranged for the interns in one center on the day of their building faculty meetings. By the time the course dismissed, the students had had a fifteen-hour day. The instructor described what happened:

> They were very groupy, and they had this high *esprit de corps.* There is no question about that, and it was very hard to break through this in the beginning. They seemed exhausted with their daily activities and they were always complaining about how much they had to do. It occurred to me, and I told them, that they were feeling sorry for themselves. There were a few other students in the class who also worked all day—a factory worker

and four or five other teachers, and they never seemed as fatigued even though they were older. It occurred to me later that maybe part of the problem was that these students felt they were under observation, everyone was watching them, and maybe they were attending to things in the classroom others weren't. So I think now that maybe they were not conning me. I found that they frequently weren't prepared—hadn't done their reading and they weren't prepared to discuss or anything else. They were completely apathetic.

One night [illegible] went to a coffee shop that they go to after class and there was a [illegible] they sort of thought I was one of the boys and we're all one big happy family. And I think they had this fantasy that they were a special group and deserved special treatment. I had this feeling that they expected me to have far more sympathy with the fact that they had been teaching all day than I did have.

There were a number of leaders who definitely set the tone for the group. I finally took these aside and put it to them and they admitted they had been behaving in an adolescent way, like a bunch of kids, and in the last weeks of the course things improved. In an on-campus class you have heterogeneous students who for the most part have never seen each other before; but here you have people who come into your class not as individuals but as a group. They know each other quite well and they're going to do a lot more communicating among themselves than in any other class, which could have a lot to do with the kind of climate that this class had all term. It might have been different had I been more sensitive to this from the beginning, but I was not. I suspect one of the dangers when you build this kind of group you also build a kind of dependency. The weak ones really lean on the strong ones. There's Hall for example. The group really protected him. Hall could say some things in class that were very simple, the kind of responses that in any other class would have set the students tittering, or would have embarrased them. But I never got this. As a matter of fact, there were many times when someone else would come in to add to what he said, almost as if to support it, or put a good face on it.

The group cohesion could work for, as well as against, the instructor, of course. In at least one instance where a course was offered that had only tangential, if any, relevance to the work of the interns, the students took a quite different position. Here too, the exigencies of scheduling put the course at an awkward time. But in this instance, the students told us the instructor's obvious enthusiasm for his subject and his care in planning the sessions impressed the interns even though, as far as they could see, the value of the course was mainly that it helped them accumulate three more college credits. But the students got involved and asked so many questions that when the instructor expressed concern about getting through his notes, they volunteered to mimeograph those he didn't cover and distribute them during the week.

To summarize, then, the shift of formal instruction in professional education from the campus made it possible to free the instructor from constraints of the campus. "Formal" instruction becomes "informal" and it became possible for the instructor to arrange experiences that could be accomplished on campus only with difficulty, if at all. Instruction became less highly structured since the pre-interns' questions made it difficult to maintain the tight and orderly sequences of campus instruction. Most important, the necessity to devote large portions of class time to the description of schools, and of children in schools, was obviated and the basic motivation of the students shifted from that of earning grades and credits to more intrinsic concerns—especially that of getting help with some of the problems that they were encountering in their practice.

Not every instructor could tap the potential in this new instructional setting. For some, the absence of the usual campus controls proved uncomfortable. Moreover, the growth of group cohesion among the pre-interns in each center added a new dimension to the instructor's task, with which not all were able to cope.

The instructor's ability and willingness to alter his campus teaching style was not, however, the principal factor limiting instruction in the new setting. A careful selection of instructors could easily have surmounted these difficulties. More fundamental constraints on instruction existed and we will examine these next.

C. THE IMPACT OF WORK IN A SCHOOL ON INSTRUCTION IN PEDAGOGY

The chief justification for a pre-internship (and for the internship as well) is a belief that it will enhance the student's integration of the "theory" and "practice" of teaching. Presumably, a two-way exchange will occur as the student brings her work experiences to bear on the examination of generalizations about teaching, and practice will become less a matter of habitual response and more a matter of the application of warranted principles and examined purpose.

This argument is commonly made by those who see the internship as the next forward step in teacher education. Typically, the implication is that "integration" will occur almost automatically if only work and study are brought together in time, and it is seldom made clear just *what* theory will get related to *what* practice.

As we have seen, the anticipated two-way exchange often did occur in STEP. But our analysis would be incomplete if we failed to make it clear that pressures for conformity to the demands of the school often caused the work and study experiences to be quite separate ones for the students. Such pressures seldom took the form of a *direct* intervention by school administrators or established teachers though, to be sure, some incidents did occur in the early months of STEP's operations. In some centers coordinators were called in to explain why local school policies had been ignored or criticized in the formal classes. But such incidents were infrequent, and the coordinators interpreted them as expressions of natural concern that the pre-interns become aware of the reasons for existing policy, and that they be taught to handle the methods and materials in use locally. There was no intent, it was felt, to prevent the instructors from examining different or conflicting policies or procedures; nor did the coordinators conclude that their freedom to criticize was being seriously challenged. If anything, the coordinators more often were anxious to increase rather than decrease the involvement of school people in the formal instruction of the students.

The constraints on the instructor's freedom did not result from any attempt by school personnel to dictate the STEP curriculum; they stemmed, rather, from the pre-interns' strong identification with the established teachers with whom they were now working. Personal identification developed quickly once the student entered into the daily life of a school. As we have suggested, many students began teaching with vague and often sentimental notions about the nature of the teacher's job. The established teachers to whom the students were assigned were among the most capable in each center and their skill inclined the students to take them as models whatever the teacher's style and point of view. Thus, in part, the pre-intern's identification with her supervising teacher reflected the student's sudden recognition that teaching was a more complex affair than she had imagined it to be, and the student's admiration of the supervising teacher's skill in coping with this complexity.

Undoubtedly, too, the student's enthusiasm for the children facilitated identification with her supervising teacher, as both worked to achieve common objectives with the pupils. The result was that the pre-interns internalized their supervising teacher's attitudes and values.

The students themselves were not always aware that they were mirroring the opinions of their supervising teachers. But they gave us cues that this was occurring. Typically, students made assessments of children, expressed preferences for methods, reflected attitudes and even evaluated their own strengths and weaknesses in ways that were completely in harmony with the judgments that their supervising teachers made independently to us. Imitation sometimes even extended to the use of the teacher's gestures and speech mannerisms.

Not all of the students found their supervising teachers attractive, congenial or worthy of imitation, of course. Some students told us that their supervising teachers represented everything that they themselves did *not* want to be as a teacher. In each center a few made their distaste evident both in, and outside of, their interviews with the evaluation staff. However, with few exceptions those students who failed to identify with their supervising teachers found it wisest to accommodate, to appear to go along. Unlike the campus student-teacher who often has little reluctance to express disapproval openly, the nonconformists among the pre-interns were very much aware that their retention in the school system, and entry into the internship, depended on their success in appearing to subordinate their own opinions to those of their supervising teachers.

Whether the student really did identify with her supervising teacher or whether she only gave the appearance of doing so, the results for formal instruction were the same. The student's first loyalty was now given to the teachers and children in her shcool. This primacy showed most clearly when university and school made conflicting demands on the student's time. The typical response in such situations was to let the college studies take second place. And this was as true among the unpaid pre-interns as among the paid interns for whom, perhaps, it was more appropriate behavior. The importance the students attached to their work in the schools is suggested by the following comments of one of the coordinators:

> They played off their school work against me, and me against their supervising teachers. But mostly their school against me. There was H— that I flunked out of the program and in our *post mortem* interview she was quite frank to admit it. She said, "Well, I just didn't do the work in the language arts class. I'll admit it. I just didn't think you were going to be this tough on me. There were so many things going on at school." And this rather surprised me because I thought I had made it quite clear in the low grades I had given, and in the kinds of assignments that I had made, that the classes were a vital part of getting the college degree. Evidently not. Most of the people have worked hard. Some of the supervising teachers were even afraid that they were working too hard . . . that they would sour on teaching. They (the students) just didn't see my class as that important. It's not unlike the reaction of students in regular student teaching. They just can't see the value of the seminars.

It was not that formal studies became unimportant; this was apparent when the pre-interns returned to the University campus after their year in the schools. There were then few complaints about the necessity of having to "take" particular courses, as had been true during the first summer. But the students felt that their work with the children was even more significant, and it was certainly more exciting, than their college classes. Just as the work in the schools took priority, so too the "significant other" for the pre-intern became the supervising teacher, rather than the college instructor. This was especially evident whenever the pre-intern felt that her school or supervising teacher was being criticized. Overt criticism by an instructor was not required in order for the student to feel that the wisdom or competence of her supervising teacher was being challenged; nor was it necessary for the instructor to have intended any criticism at all. But if, for example, an instructor examined *both* the advantages and disadvantages of homogeneous grouping, this was interpreted as indicating disapproval of the existing arrangement in the school—whatever it was. Or if an instructor commented favorably on the introduction of set theory into elementary school arithmetic, this was viewed as criticism if the new math had not yet reached the center. Or, if a student asked for an explanation of why her supervising teacher had treated a pupil in a specific way, and received not an explanation, but the advocacy of some alternative treatment, this too could bring the student to the defense of her teacher.

Thus, whether or not criticism was intended, whether it was explicit or implicit, the pre-interns were quick to protect *their* teachers and *their* school. A student might show her displeasure openly by exclaiming, "But *we* don't do it that way," or "That's all right in *theory* but it won't work." More often, a passive strategy was employed. Students refused to introduce examples or problems based on their work experiences into the formal class discussion, or found reasons why an instructor could not be invited to visit their classroom.

Even when the pre-intern herself was critical of practices employed in her school, and even when she did not identify with her supervising teacher, the student learned that it was better not to open up certain topics for analysis by her instructors and fellow students. The school grapevine could make this a dangerous practice. If, for example, the pre-intern asked for clarification of what she thought was a questionable practice, she discovered that her question got back to her supervising teacher very quickly, often in an exaggerated or distorted form. The questioning student learned that it was prudent to volunteer only "safe" questions, illustrations and opinions.

Thus, either to protect their supervising teachers or to keep their relationships harmonious, the students set limits and defined the areas into which they would permit their instructors to go. One instructor, who came out from campus, was especially surprised to encounter this reaction:

> Whenever I work with an off-campus group I try to get in and see the conditions under which they are working. I feel I do a better job and it's not too difficult to do; you just leave campus a few hours earlier. But this was the first group in the 12 years I've been working off-campus courses that did not invite me into their classrooms. I gave them all an opportunity to do so. So I had to content myself with circling their buildings. The students were quite careful not to criticize their supervisors. On the other hand they didn't praise them either and this was most unusual. Yet I know some of them got a good deal of help from their supervisors on the demonstration

materials they made for class; it was obvious that they had had some expert coaching. I had to force examples out of them at times. Nine times out of ten in an in-service class when you raise a question the teachers will answer with an example. But with this group it occurred very seldom. I don't know why. I thought at first it might be because they were not sure whether they should do this and unveil something that shouldn't be unveiled about the school and the teachers. I'll be very frank. Once I overheard a very hot argument between two or three of them on whether they should volunteer to do something, bring something in from the school. Evidently that wasn't done.

Some instructors sensed more quickly than others that their students were limiting discussion. Some who did not, concluded rather that the students were "immature in the sense that they couldn't see problems themselves. Once these were brought to their attention, they were able to discuss and act on them." But whether the principal cause was the students' "immaturity" or their identification with their work situations, the result was that certain topics became sensitive ones. Depending on local conditions, students refused to initiate discussions of certain issues. Equally important, the more perceptive instructors themselves hesitated to introduce questions when it was so apparent that their students were not "ready" for them.

The classroom teacher is, of necessity, "task-oriented." Teachers must act to achieve relatively immediate goals. The children are *there*, and the teacher must do *something*. Suspended judgment and indecision are luxuries that can be afforded only infrequently. It is not that the teacher is interested only in what is "practical" and rejects "theory," although this is the way the matter often gets put. Obviously, a teacher's actions will be based on some generalizations, whether these have been examined by her or not, and whether these are warranted by tested evidence or only by habit or authority. But—and this is the point—for the teacher the weighing of alternatives is not an end in itself as it often is, and properly should be, for the college instructor; the teacher must act as well as discuss. (We refer, of course, to the instructor in his role as a "critic" not in his role as "teacher.")

Moreover, even in the most permissive of school systems, the decisions a teacher can actually make are carefully circumscribed. Perhaps this is inevitable, for in the conduct of schools, as in the maintenance of any other social institution, some conformity is mandatory. The question of what ought to be taught when and for what purpose is a matter that concerns the classroom teacher as much as it does any other citizen. But in the situations in which she works as a "teacher," the answers to these challenging and perplexing issues are givens, and whatever her personal interests, convictions or biases, the teacher must act *as if* these givens, however they have been arrived at, are valid.

College instructors of education, even when they themselves have had considerable prior experience as classroom teachers, often exaggerate the freedom of an individual teacher to alter basically the situational context in which she works. Experienced teachers, to be sure, learn how to circumvent or ignore what they consider to be the most serious restrictions on their practice. It is also true that in many schools teachers are given considerable freedom to decide how they shall implement policy within their own classrooms. But effecting fundamental alterations in basic policy may mean neglecting the children, toward whom the teacher is likely to feel her chief commitment, in order to engage in committee work, discussions with power figures, and other essentially political activities. Most elementary school teachers find such activity distasteful and seek to avoid it if they can. One of the coordinators, himself a man with considerable experience as a classroom teacher, came to see the teacher in a new light as a result of his experiences in STEP:

> I now have a much more precise idea of the level at which some of these people (teachers) have to work. One woman said to me, "don't forget I'm only a first grade teacher," and I was tempted to answer, "I know, how could I forget it!" I didn't mean that as harshly as it sounds, but I knew pretty much the level at which she was operating and the shrinkage that had occurred over the years for her. You know there is a tendency for people who have been away from the field to forget what it is like. Now I don't mean that you have to be a cow to know what milk is, but maybe it is beneficial. It's like the army; you get together with your buddies ten years later and you say, "Weren't those the days. They were good. Boy, remember when we did this and this." You forget about the latrine duty. When these teachers complain that we don't know what we're talking about, they might be right. In one sense we do know, but we have forgotten. We certainly have forgotten the jagged edges of the problems they have to contend with. And so we curse these people for compromising their souls and not having the guts to do something better when you can't really expect them to be a heck of a lot different than they are. They do pretty well considering the things they have to contend with. This is probably the most important thing I have seen in the last three years. On campus you forget the context in which these people are working.

Caught up, then, in highly structured situations, and concerned to get on with the accomplishment of well defined tasks, the established teacher is often impatient with college instructors' eagerness to engage in the analysis of conflicting alternatives. To be asked to consider six approaches to the teaching of reading, for example, and theory underlying each, may seem an irrelevant exercise to a person under considerable pressure to discover ways of making the fullest use of the one approach the local school is employing. To the teacher who knows that next day's plan book calls for a 30-minute lesson on the law of conservation, a discussion on whether science should be taught in the elementary school, and if taught, to what end, may seem an exercise in futility.

The pre-interns, concerned about their ability to take over a classroom in any case, and caught up in the same context as their supervising teachers, also expressed their impatience to get on with the job and insisted that they be taught the tools of the trade. And the teachers with whom they now identified reinforced the students' concern. They insisted that the pre-interns be made ready to meet the daily problems of "keeping school." It is not that the pre-interns or supervising teachers were interested *only* in the immediate tasks at hand. But both wanted "first things to come first." And both gave priority to the acquisition of a methodology which would permit the intern to survive. The effects of the students' and supervisors' "task oriented" point of view on the college instructor's freedom can be illustrated best by describing in some detail the early experience at one of the centers. In this center the original plan called for a heavy emphasis on the foundations of education: psychology, sociology and philosophy. No systematic examination of teaching methods, as such, was provided; the pre-interns were to acquire technical skills as they worked in the schools. Here is how the center coordinator described what happened:

> We started out in the fall with the educational psychology course and we thought rather naively that there would be transfer to the actual classroom operation. After about a month of this the kids began pushing me hard for things that would *really* help them. Their supervising teachers didn't really know how to handle them, what to expect of them. We kept telling the teachers about the fact that they shouldn't expect this and they shouldn't expect that. The teachers were used to the regular student teachers and couldn't quite accept the fact that these students had a whole year to get on top of the job. Fortunately, for the most part they liked these kids and so they carried us over this early period of adjustment. But about in November they began to say, "Well, they can do a lot of things. They can keep records and make nice bulletin boards and they can handle the children on the playground. But they don't know anything about teaching reading." The kids themselves were quite concerned and we kept telling them things we didn't quite believe any more. They were in the schoolroom three days a week and that was far too much for the skills they had, or at least there wasn't enough that the teachers would trust them to do. And this became an irritant to everyone, teachers and kids alike. So we pulled the kids out of school for two weeks and tried to tie up a lot of the psych concepts we had been developing.

Was That When You Started the Methods Classes?

No, we still didn't move in the direction of methods courses. We kept telling the teachers that they were more or less responsible and told the kids that they would learn what they needed to know in the process of working with the teachers. But the teachers didn't have the time, and it's questionable whether they had any systematic knowledge any more, other than whatever system they'd developed for themselves in their own operating situation. In other words they can't talk at length comparing various approaches to reading, for example, or the various approaches to anything else. Now there are some who are exceptions. But even the run of-the-mill supervisor just hasn't got these things at her fingertips. Why we ever expected her to is hard to see now. This isn't her business as such. But we still stuck to our original plan.

Despite the Pressure to Change it?

There was a lot of that. We went on with the sociology, or rather the social foundations of education. The kids were very much interested in this because by this time they were concerned with many alleged injustices, and inconsistencies that seemed to show up within their individual classrooms, and in the buildings. It was a thrill for me after campus. But there was this continuing demand to do something about methods, especially from some of the people who were hostile to the program to begin with. So finally we gave in. We changed the plan and brought in Ned to do something about reading in place of the independent study we had planned. And we dropped the extension of the psych and soc we had for them and decided to get them into at least two other methods areas.

So You Went All the Way.

We had to. The kids had to have some confidence in themselves and so did the teachers they worked with, and so did central administration. And frankly so did I before I was willing to say that they were ready for the internship. The kids really went to town on this. Ned felt that he had never had such an eager group. They had built up a high degree of anxiety about their lack of knowledge of methods so they were very interested, plus the fact that they had had some background on the children. They had a pretty good notion about readiness factors and they were much better prepared to go into a study of methods. Ned mentioned this to me several times. We brought George into town to teach the math methods but apparently they felt less anxiety-ridden about math than they did about reading. Perhaps this is because so many of them are in lower el. To do all of this we had to pull the kids out of the schools. As a result there was an increasing undertone of discontent among the supervising teachers. There'd be little complaints about the youngsters not being able to really take over. They'd praise the kids and then say they still needed a lot more experience, or they'd say they don't know how to really attack this kind of problem.

They Didn't Want to Let Them Go?

> They didn't want to let them go and they got quite vocal about it. This was probably the nastiest moment we had. Because in spite of the fact that they thought the youngsters lacked certain things, the supervising teachers felt they too had something to offer these kids and they wanted to offer it to these kids and they were very hostile to pulling these kids out for the methods classes. It was the only time I really laid it on the line so openly. I said "Look, you can't have it both ways. You say they haven't got it in the methods area and now we're going to give it to them. We've got to take them out of the school. You've made your pitch for three months and we've taken your advice. Now put up or shut up." I said it in not much less blunt terms than that. It was surprising. I was afraid the meeting was going to blow up, but they suddenly realized that they were asking to have their cake and eat it too, and they kind of chuckled and admitted it. They said they didn't like the youngsters to get away from the classroom situation but they bought the idea of methods courses.

It is noteworthy that though the pressure to change the focus of instruction originated with the pre-interns and their supervising teachers, the coordinator himself eventually came to share their opinion. Undoubtedly the pressure on the coordinator was more intense in this center because of the prior decision to forego formal instruction in methods. But the same phenomenon, if in a milder form, occurred in each of the other centers.

A similar problem developed, for example, in a second center where the initial plan had called for the pre-interns to undertake an extensive study of their community; methods instruction was not totally eliminated, but was reduced to make a possible concentration on urban sociology and field studies in the community. The students' field reports excited much favorable comment among the building principals; *they* saw the relevancy of knowledge about community resources and the power structure. One principal, in fact, mimeographed the reports for distribution to all of his regular teachers. But the students themselves, reflecting the concern of their supervising teachers, were not so confident about the worth of these studies. As the first months passed, dissatisfaction was openly expressed, especially by the younger students. Finally, the field studies were abandoned. As in the first center, it was not so much that the pre-interns were disinterested but rather, again, there was concern that "first things come first."

Even in the four other centers where formal instruction was purposefully focused on methods and materials courses, the task orientation of the supervising teachers and the internalization of that point of view by the pre-interns had an impact on instruction. An illustration, instructive even if somewhat trivial, involved the matter of bulletin boards. We were puzzled that the pre-interns appeared to attach such great importance to the preparation and maintenance of attractive boards and other room displays. It was easy to understand that a colorful room was preferable to a drab one, and to recognize that some benefits might accrue to pupils as the result of well planned and cheerful displays. But it was difficult to see why the students should respond so enthusiastically to instructors who provided ideas for displays that they could use; after all, this hardly seemed a matter worthy of university-level instruction. Yet when we asked the supervising teachers to evaluate their students' performances we discovered that the ability to do a pleasing and informative display, or the lack of such ability, was a frequent criterion of progress. Finally an established teacher, perhaps more frank and cynical than his fellows, gave us one explanation of the phenomenon. "What can a parent, or a supervisor, or even a building principal really learn about your teaching in a visit to your classroom? They're usually there for only a few minutes; what they see is how the children look, and how the rooms look, not what you are actually doing." Seen in this way, the pre-interns' concern that they be given help with their displays becomes quite reasonable. (The wisdom of meeting that concern in university-level courses is another matter.)

Instructors, and students themselves, noted that it was often difficult to develop interest when the matters under discussion appeared tangential to the grade level for which the student was preparing. Thus, students teaching at the upper elementary grades became apathetic when time was given to the primary grade teacher's problem of building a sight vocabulary or constructing experience charts. And those preparing for the early grades were likely to be equally disinterested if the instructor turned to the problems faced by those teaching reading at the later grades: developing library skills, or an appreciation for style, and the like.

Thus, in general, the immersion of the students into the daily work of the schools limited the instructor in two important ways: The defensiveness of the students narrowed his freedom to engage in a critical analysis of the school's practice, and their task-orientation restricted the range of topics he could explore with profit. An instructor might, of course, ignore both constraints, but if he did so he ran the risk that his instruction and the student's work in the schools would become two separate experiences. In this event, few advantages remained to justify moving instruction off the college campus. Accepting some limitation of the instructor's freedom, we believe, is part of the price one must be willing to pay for the many benefits that can accrue when teachers are prepared in more realistic settings. "Theory" and "practice" will get related, but his integration may occur within narrower limits than is usually implied by many who advocate an internship. The conditions under which integration is most likely were suggested in the following discussion:

How Would You Evaluate Teaching in this Setting?

The most obvious advantage of the program is that anything we discussed or read about could immediately be related to the classroom situation. This I noticed as being true particularly in arithmetic. When we dealt with a certain aspect of arithmetic which involved a technique that was new they tried it out, or if we dealt with certain kinds of teaching material, they not only gathered it up, or created it, but they functioned with it. I watched about half the students teach and I saw many evidences of this carry-over in arithmetic. But there was a difference in language arts and reading. I saw very little carry-over in these.

Any Hunches Why?

In the first place they realized their inadequacy in arithmetic and so they were more highly motivated. I think also it may have been because I took an historical approach to arithmetic and I think it intrigued them. I just didn't start talking about addition and subtraction and how they taught it in their schools, you know, talking about whether kids should add from the bottom or from the top. But I talked about the way the Egyptians would add, and the way you would use an abacus in medieval Europe, and so forth. I think there was a kind of freshness and also they were intrigued with some of these things and they took them out to their classrooms and began to use them. The kids would take it into their classrooms and begin to try it out with *their* kids, and they would get excited, and that built up. Some exciting things have happened here that just didn't happen in the language arts.

But Why?

Well, in reading if you want to innovate, it is kind of big. In reading I talked about the structure of the reading program for instance. In arithmetic you can innovate without really upsetting the basic structure of the school's curriculum. You can feed in smaller things in arithmetic, but in reading there didn't seem to be any avenue where they could unobtrusively use the things we talked about. We talked about phonics. Well, if they are going to do this it calls for a major reorientation. The same is true for social studies. But not science. There you can bootleg more easily. Certain areas lend themselves to the kind of bridging in which we're interested in this program. Then too in certain areas there's greater receptivity to change right now. Science is the best example. Everyone feels this is an area where they should be doing something but the older teachers feel inadequate in it and this makes it possible for the younger ones to take over. In talking about the social studies you find yourself being moralistic, and this is an area where the kid's teachers have their own views.

This coordinator's hunches were supported by our interviews. For one thing, when asked what in their formal training had been most helpful, the majority of interns mentioned methods courses in arithmetic or science. A few spoke favorably of the work they had had in the teaching of reading. The methods work in social studies received the fewest favorable mentions of all. This ordering was consistent in all centers and was independent of the special competence of the instructors or the sequence of the courses. The coordinator whom we have just quoted, for example, was known for his special ability in the teaching of the social studies and did not consider himself especially proficient in arithmetic methods. Moreover, supervising teachers told us that they were quite willing to let their pre-interns assume responsibility for teaching math, and would permit the pre-intern to "do" all of the science with only a minimum amount of direction. But teachers, especially in the lower grades, were much less willing to assign responsibility for instruction in reading, and often began by keeping the pre-intern under the closest kind of supervision. In general, whatever subject the supervising teacher felt was most important or felt most proficient in, would be the last subject which the pre-intern would be allowed to teach.

At least part of the explanation for the greater frequency with which formal instruction in mathematics and science transferred directly into the student's practice is that in these areas where the college instructor was least likely to challenge the authority of the supervising teacher and were, thus, fields about which the pre-interns were willing to raise questions in their college class.

In general, and with notable exceptions, what the pre-interns wanted from their college instructors was help in what is usually called the "methods and materials" of teaching. But even here a distinction must be made. Conceptions of what should properly be included in a methods course vary widely among the instructors of such courses. For some, methods courses appear to be an opportunity to reexamine psychological and sociological principles as these get applied in a particular subject matter field. When this point of view is exaggerated, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the methods course that results from courses called "educational psychology," "educational sociology," or "educational philosophy." And methods courses of this kind were *not* well received. Rather, the pre-interns wanted two kinds of help. They wanted information that would be immediately useful with the children with whom they were working, and they wanted help in understanding the concepts that they were supposed to teach. The students ranked their studies in arithmetic and science methods high because instructors in these areas were most likely to clarify the concepts the students were expected to teach, and were most likely to supply the students with demonstrations, materials and motivational devices that they could use without undertaking a major revision of the school's curriculum.

Students differed, of course, in the intensity of their demands for immediately useful instruction and in their reluctance to engage in an analysis of their teaching situations. Obviously, too, the students' concern that they be given a "survival methodology" lessened as they moved from the pre-internship to the internship itself. No less, coordinators and instructors differed in the importance they themselves attached to critical analysis. The administrative arrangements made in a particular center for the assignment of students to schools also appeared to have differential effects: Where assignments were made to several schools rather than to a single building, where the pre-intern was responsible to a building principal rather than to a single classroom teacher, and, especially, where interns in a center worked in several different school systems, the instructor had greater freedom. But despite all these sources of variation, the effect of moving instruction in pedagogy off campus posed an old problem in a new form. Both William James and John Dewey in their time described the demands teachers made upon them for the "right" answers to practical problems. Both argued that it was not the business of university professors to satisfy these demands. Both maintained that the university's primary function was that of developing new knowledge, and that for this endeavor critical analysis and suspended judgment is a pre-condition. James went even further and questioned whether the then new science of psychology could ever have more than negative implications for the art of teaching. That is to say, James felt that while psychologists might be able to suggest what would *not* be effective (and even this in only the most general terms) they could not tell teachers what would work in their many varied and special situations.[5] Whether the development of psychology (and the other behavioral sciences) justifies a change in this point of view need not concern us here. For even if more "right" answers for the teacher's technical questions may be available now, the critical and analytic function still remains the university's special responsibility.

If critical analysis *is* an essential purpose of university instruction, then the faculty member in education appears to be caught in a squeeze whether his instruction is offered on or off-campus. If he teaches on campus, the instructor faces students with only limited experience with schools as social organizations and with the behavior of children in classrooms. The analysis of problems with such students can be barren. In the off-campus setting, the instructor, to be sure, no longer must contend with a lack of an experiential background among his students. But, if our observations are valid, the identification of the student with established teachers and the adoption of the teacher's "task-orientation" also limits the instructor's freedom to engage profitably in his role as a critic of existing practice. Integration of "theory" and "practice" occurs in a work-study program, but this is mostly at the level of the practical and technical.

---

[5] John Dewey, "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education," Chicago: *NSSE Yearbook III*, Part 1, 1904; William James, *Talks to Teachers on Psychology*, New York: Holt, 1899.

D. ACHIEVING A BALANCE BETWEEN THE TECHNICAL AND THE PROFESSIONAL

The response of individual instructors and resident coordinators to the constraints which have just been described were as varied as their backgrounds. Those who most closely identified with the campus community were, as one might expect, more likely to express concern than those whose primary affiliations were with classroom teachers and school men. Three basic responses can be described. though in connection with specific incidents, the three positions were not as clearly separated as our analysis will imply.

A first response was simply that of ignoring the issue and, in an extreme case, abdicating any claim to an independent critical role for the university. One instructor reacted in this way:

> I question the amount of effect I may have had in contrast to the impact of what the students were observing being done by the supervising teachers. We made it clear to the students that we weren't trying to change the supervising teachers, and that they shouldn't question them if they didn't like what they saw. We weren't going to dictate the curriculum even if we had felt it was our business to do so. We were fitting in. We tried very hard to make it clear that we saw ourselves as guests in the teacher's house.

The view just quoted represented an extension to the pre-internship program of the commonly held opinion of the appropriate school-university relationship in the regular student teaching program. In the latter the school makes established teachers and classrooms available to student-teachers and receives relatively little in the way of a direct return. True, there are many indirect benefits: a first chance at employing promising teachers, stimulation of the staff, and the like. But, essentially, the school system is rendering a service to the teaching profession. The modest honoraria that are sometimes paid either to the supervising teachers or to the school system are little more than tokens of appreciation, and do not begin to compensate for the school's services in directing the student-teacher. The university and student-teacher are, in fact, guests of the school and the recognition of this reality is clearly appropriate.

The situation is quite different in the pre-internship and internship —at least as the program developed at Michigan State and at some other universities. Now the school and university agreed to join in providing not only a capstone experience, but the total professional training of the student. The clear lines of demarcation between instruction and practice which occur in the typical on-campus program have been deliberately blurred. A relationship somewhat more profound than that of "guest" to "host" is required if the advantages of the internship are to be fully realized.

In the internship program, either party to the agreement may come to dominate it. But if either does, both will be the losers. If the university comes to view the schools as simply a "laboratory" for the preparation of interns, and if this view were to be fully realized, the university would fail in that its offerings would not be subjected to a reality test. In such an event one could ask why a university-controlled "lab" school would not serve more effectively. On the other hand, if the schools view the university simply as a training arm for the preparation of teachers to meet its particular requirements, the school would fail to derive the benefits that can come from having its purposes and practices challenged and examined. In this event, one could ask why the training function would not be more effectively carried out by personnel unmistakably identified with and responsible to the school system.

A second basic response was made by those instructors and coordinators who chose to sharpen such differences as did arise. This response was, in effect, also a form of withdrawal though it took the form of emphasizing differences rather than denying their existence. One of the coordinators expressed this point of view most vividly:

> I have a particular point of view with regard to administrative behavior and the importance of the classroom teacher and so forth. I wasn't willing to operate on the grounds that these teachers felt most comfortable with. I prefer not to be directive but to give a large area of decision to the classroom teacher. I have a certain pride in my view and thought I had the answer, you know. It is simply very difficult for people here to accept my definition of what teacher and administrative behavior ought to be like. To some extent I was crusading. I think this is just utter foolishness too. They don't understand my view. They can't understand it. It is foolish for pragmatic reasons. You are not going to get anything done this way. But for some reason I have felt it necessary to sharpen differences. If my normal behavior and views were say just 30 degrees off what is done here, I've felt it necessary to act 45 degrees off. Take the matter of dress . . . I would deliberately wear the hunting shirt instead of a white shirt. So what harm is there in a white shirt if it enhances your role? To some considerable extent I have not been my normal self here; I have accented some of these differences. I don't recommend it as a policy but the fact that I have felt the need to do so might well be examined.

Whatever the pressures and frustrations which may have led to this particular coordinator's reaction, the effect of sharpening policy differences was just as deleterious as was the first instructor's abdication. His pre-interns, especially, were placed in a most difficult position. They were asked to choose between a coordinator whom most respected, and their supervising teachers and the schools with whom many had identified. The students' resolution of this conflict was, most typically, to treat their work in the schools and their formal instruction as two quite separate experiences. They resorted to various defenses in order to effect the separation. The coordinator, for example, found appointments for visits in the schools cancelled. The students would elaborate subtle rationales to explain why, in fact, apparent differences between their coordinator and their teachers did not *really* exist. Thus, he was seen as addressing himself to what *ought* to be, while the school people were wrestling with what *was*. The students carefully avoided examining whether any connection between the two sets of problems ought to exist.

Quite apart from the stressful situation created for the pre-interns and interns, the decision to accentuate differences was self-defeating, of course. If the policy had been carried to an extreme (and it was not, even by the coordinator quoted above, for he was exaggerating in order to make his point), instruction of the pre-interns might better have been returned to the college campus. At least on campus the students would not have been confronted daily by the conflicts between the practices and policies they saw used in the schools and those their instructor advocated.

In contrast to both forms of withdrawal, a third response was to accommodate to the new constraints while at the same time trying to preserve an independent role for the university. This course of action can be called "compromise" or "cooperation," depending on one's biases. Whatever it is called, most coordinators elected this alternative:

> I've had to compromise, and I'm going to have to compromise even more. There is a (local) way of doing things, and at least some of the power figures don't want a whole bunch of teachers being educated in this city without having a foot on the throttle. I've gone along for a number of reasons. Number one is that the program wouldn't exist if you didn't. That is a primary consideration. You've got to survive before you do anything else. And then you know it might not necessarily be bad. The compromise really isn't over the fact that the kids need to know what is going on locally. Of course they do. The compromise comes when the pressure is on not to ask questions, not to have the students ask questions to avoid rocking the boat. You don't want to argue the point because you like the people involved, and then boat-rocking is not an act that is practiced with safety in an on-going situation. You and the students have to live with the situation. So you can't react to a direct challenge to your beliefs for a number of reasons, but the main one is that the students react to challenge with an emotional response. And I know I'll compromise even more because the

areas of knowledge aren't clear-cut enough for me to hold out for something else. It's hard to be *that* sure you're right.

Achieving a proper balance between the pre-intern's pressure for answers to "how and what?" and the college instructors' desire to explore "why and to what end?" is not *uniquely* a problem of the internship approach to teacher education; nor is the conflict between the schoolman's need to maintain stability, enforce norms, and provide for orderly change and the university critic's preference for continual reappraisal, experimentation and more radical solutions. Conflicting priorities between schoolmen and academicians have been responsible for many of the 180-degree turns that teacher education has taken in the United States since the development of the first normal schools. As teachers of teachers have struggled to achieve a balance, the line of development has resembled the track made by a driver in his first encounter with power steering. Each attempt to correct an imbalance in emphasis has eventually given rise to a new imbalance and a new over-correction.[6]

Perhaps the cyclical development of teacher education is inevitable; it may be that action and reaction is the inherent characteristic of any institutional change. But it may also be that the sharp swings in the dominant thought about teacher education testifies to the long separation of the teacher-educator and the teacher. A more regular line of development would require immediate and continuous communication between school and university. In the absence of an immediate feedback and information on which to base small corrections, revision in teacher education waits on the accumulation of small grievances until the pressure for change becomes inescapable. The result is that when shifts do occur they are often over-corrections, and movement in teacher training is from one imbalance to another.

What is new in the internship arrangement is not the search for a proper balance between the technical and professional in teacher education, but the conditions under which that search proceeds. Of these conditions the most distinctive is the shared responsibility of the university and the school for both the pre- and in-service preparation of the teacher. It is true that schoolmen and academicians have cooperated in the past on many projects for the improvement of practice and for basic research, but these enterprises have not usually called for either the sustained effort, or the degree of mutual involvement that the realization of the potential of the internship demands. For in this, both the university and the school assert a claim on the student throughout the lengthy period of his induction, and both seek to guide him in the development of his teaching style and, what is more important, these efforts proceed simultaneously. But if the potential in this joint effort is to be realized, then some "compromise" of the legitimate but different concerns of the university and school is required. Either to deny that differences exist or to magnify them would be self-defeating.

---

[6] Walter S. Monroe, *Teaching-Learning Theory and Teacher Education, 1890-1950*, Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1952.

The prospects that a satisfactory "compromise" can be reached are enhanced, we believe, once it is recognized that not everything needs to be done at once; that the teacher-to-be is ready to examine different kinds of questions at different times. This seems an obvious enough proposition and yet, judging by our own experience, it was difficult for the staff, both from the University and the school, to square their own early anxieties for the students with this truism.

It took time for those guiding the pre-interns really to accept the fact that they no longer had to complete the entire preparation of the student in the first year of their professional study. Some coordinators told us that in the beginning they had felt it necessary to plan every moment of the pre-intern's week and they had had to fight a need to explore every question to its limits when the pre-interns first raised it. The supervising teachers, too, at first equated the pre-interns with student teachers they had known in the past, and, even though they recognized that the pre-interns would be with them for ten months rather than ten weeks, still felt obligated to have the pre-intern ready to take over a classroom as early as possible. As a result, in the pilot year, the best of the pre-interns were carrying total responsibility for some segment of the curriculum (usually science) before their first month in the school had ended. Later many of the intern consultants, too, had to resist inclinations to force-feed their interns.

Finally those involved in the preparation of the students accepted emotionally, as well as intellectually, that learning to be a teacher—like any other learning—required development over time. When this understanding was truly internalized, the pressure to effect rapid changes in the pre-interns was reduced, and only then did a basis for a "compromise" between the conflicting interests of the school and University become apparent. Becoming a teacher requires a constant reappraisal by the individual student of the essential nature of teaching, of one's personal commitment, and of one's personal identity as a teacher. And becoming a teacher involves a mastery of those techniques necessary for survival in specific school situations. But the deepening of understanding, the reformation of attitudes, and the refinement of skills proceed at different levels and at different rates of speed over the entire period of the induction—and beyond.

The preparation of a teacher calls now for the consideration of quite limited practical questions: what gimmicks can you suggest for handling the children's exuberance during the first snowfall of the year? How can I get the children to discriminate "b" and "p"? What can I do to make my bulletin boards more attractive? But at other times the student wants to examine quite general propositions: Should we be judging children by standards that are not applied in their homes? What does our commitment to democratic values really imply for classroom management?

The notion that these different kinds of questions must be neatly separated into discreet courses and sequentially ordered is a rationalization of the practical necessities of the college campus. In the internship arrangement, these campus necessities no longer govern—though it was some time before this fact was fully recognized. In the off-campus setting an adaptation of what Bruner, among others, has called the "spiral curriculum" became feasible—that is, fundamental ideas about the educational process and essentially technical matters could be examined early and returned to on many occasions with increasing sophistication as the student encountered new challenges in his practice.

CHAPTER 4

PROBLEMS OF THE INTERNSHIP

A. PROVIDING SUPERVISION FOR THE INTERNS

If the new teacher internship programs are to be more than expedients for exploiting beginning teachers or circumventing certification requirements, the provisions made for the guidance of the interns become critical.

In a few of the recent plans it is difficult to discover what, if any, special guidance is provided; the intern is supervised by his building principal just as any other beginning teacher would be, or occasional help is provided by a more experienced teacher in the building—the so-called "buddy" teacher. The university maintains contact through sporadic visits by a faculty member or a newsletter for interns. But, in effect, the university's main role is the placement of the intern. However well intentioned, if the university does not influence the practice of the intern, serious questions about the legitimacy of the university's involvement are in order.

More typically in the new programs, the university supervises the interns much as it does student teachers. University coordinators visit and consult with the interns in their classrooms on a regular schedule and an accompanying seminar experience may be provided. But there are difficulties in applying the student teaching model to the internship. The intern is not, after all, a student teacher. He is now a paid employee of the school system and is expected to execute local school policy. The university representative may find it difficult to avoid encroaching on the school's prerogatives.

Michigan State, as have a number of other institutions, chose a third alternative which would allow the university to exert an indirect influence on the practice of the intern but which kept the line of authority clear. A new position was created which freed competent and experienced classroom teachers for work with the interns on a full-time basis. The initial plan assigned one "intern consultant" to five first-year interns, and in the second year the ratio was increased to one-to-ten. In practice, the consultant worked with a combination of first- and second-year interns and the "case load" averaged out to about six interns per consultant.

Though the consultants' primary responsibility was to the intern, and in this sense, to the University's training program, they remained employees of the school system and retained tenure and other rights and obligations within the school system. The selection of the consultants was a joint responsibility of the resident coordinator and the central staff of the school system. Procedures varied, but most frequently the coordinator submitted a list of candidates from which the superintendent made a final choice. The direction of the work of the consultants was also a joint responsibility. The consultants shared an office with the University coordinator and he maintained a regular schedule of conference meetings with them. At these meetings they hammered out strategy and tactics and examined the problems of individual interns. In addition, the University sponsored semiannual meetings of consultants from all centers to exchange information and to clarify objectives. But the University's main influence rested on persuasion; final authority for the direction of the intern was the schools'.

In "crisis" situations as, for example, in a dispute between an intern and a building principal, the resident coordinator might intervene directly to help resolve differences, or if necessary, to effect a transfer. But unless invited, coordinators worked through the consultants rather than directly with the interns.

Additionally, the University provided the interns with the equivalent of a course a quarter during the two years of the internship. One of these was a two-credit seminar which provided the interns an opportunity to generalize on their experiences. Even in this seminar most coordinators chose to involve their consultants. Thus, in general, the coordinators were as jealous to guard the prerogatives of the school in the direction of the interns as they had been sensitive to challenges to their own authority in the instruction of the pre-interns.

In the beginning, the intern consultant position was modeled on that of the "helping teacher." This latter designation identifies a post maintained by some of the larger school systems in Michigan and elsewhere, the purpose of which is to offer guidance for beginning teachers.

But the intern consultantship differed in three ways from the helping teacher position, and each of these differences was to have an important impact on the way the consultants eventually defined their role. First, there was the matter of the University's involvement. While the consultant had only a quasi-university status, this was to prove important in preserving her freedom of action. Second, unlike the helping teacher who must often assume a "load" of twenty to thirty beginning teachers, the intern consultant was assigned relatively few individuals with whom to work; the result was that the consultant came to know not only her interns but also their pupils. Thus, her advice could take into account the special situational factors at work in each classroom and more sophisticated and relevant diagnoses of classroom problems became possible. Finally, the consultant's visits to the interns classroom were both regular and frequent.

A helping teacher, typically, works with a beginning teacher intensively only if that teacher or her building principal requests assistance. The result is that the helping teacher often enters the beginning teacher's classroom only after a major deterioration has occurred. The new teacher—and sometimes the building principal as well—may be reluctant to seek advice and may even deny the existence of a problem until a breakdown is apparent. The beginning teacher often fears to admit incompetence, but even when such fears are absent, the new teacher may simply not be aware of an impending crisis in her classroom. The experienced teacher comes to know the likely consequences of various actions and learns when "to draw the line," when to re-teach, when to close out a unit that is not going anywhere. The beginning teacher, on the other hand, can suddenly be confronted by an untenable situation, though each act which led to the crisis—her own, as well as the pupils'—may have seemed trivial and innocent. As a result the helping teacher commonly finds herself engaged in putting out fires rather than preventing them.

By contrast, the intern consultant regularly visited the intern's classroom throughout the two-year period of the internship. This continuity of contact meant that many crisis situations could be headed off and the intern could ask for help under less stressful conditions than those that often exist when the services of a "helping teacher" must be requested.

Experience has, we feel, justified the wisdom of reducing the case load of the intern consultant to make possible sustained contact with her interns. The 5-to-1 and 10-to-1 intern-consultant ratios are not, of course, magic numbers; we do not know what an ideal ratio would be. Nor is continuity of contact alone a panacea. But by reducing the number of beginners with whom the consultant had to relate, by making possible an increase in the frequency of her visits, and by establishing a quasi-university status for the consultants, STEP created a qualitatively new position.

To be sure, the functions assigned the intern consultants were not visibly different from those undertaken by the helping teacher. But the character of the relationship that could be established between the intern and consultant—though the ideal relationship was not always achieved—was substantially different and the helping teacher model failed to provide clear guidelines for those asked to assume the new role. In what follows we will describe how a definition of the new position grew out of the consultants' attempts to resolve the problems they encountered.

B. DEFINING THE INTERN CONSULTANT'S ROLE

Six teachers began working as intern consultants in the fall of 1961; this number was increased to eighteen the following year; and at present (1964), there are thirty-five persons filling the position in the six centers.

Fortunately, in the initial years of operation only a relatively small number of consultants were involved. As a result, there were few pressures to establish firm bureaucratic controls on their practices, and the first group of consultants could experiment and acquire an understanding of the adjustments that individuals who move into a position of this type must face. In addition to many more informal contacts, the evaluation staff conducted systematic interviews with the initial consultants and the analysis that follows has been based mainly on the protocols of these interviews.

Of the initial eighteen consultants, all but two came to their new posts directly from an elementary school classroom. All had had at least five years of experience as a teacher, but most had served many more years than that. All had worked with one or more student teachers in the past and all but four had functioned as a supervising teacher for a STEP pre-intern.

Though an advanced degree was not a requirement for appointment, over three-fourths of the consultants did hold such a degree, usually in Education. Finally, fourteen of the eighteen consultants interviewed were women.

The one thing all consultants had in common was that their superintendents and resident coordinators judged them to be among the most capable teachers in their school systems. The special proficiency of each consultant varied widely, however. Some were distinctive for their mastery of the teaching of reading, social studies, or some other branch of the curriculum. Others were outstanding for their ability to relate to children, and still others for their qualities as leaders of their fellow teachers. Some had been marked for advancement to principalships, though others had refused such positions in the past.

Of the many variables which could describe the initial group of consultants, the one which appeared to have the most bearing on the speed with which they adjusted to their new position was the breadth of their previous classroom experience. Consultants with service in but one or two situations were often surprised and sometimes chagrined to discover that they had not really been aware of the complexity of the school system in which they had been employed for many years. One consultant, for example, who had worked sixteen years in a single building told us:

> I think I've gained deeper insights really into the whole of elementary education by the very fact that I've had to keep moving from school to school. When you work in a building you assume everyone's problems are the same as your own. I had no idea how different schools are and what a variety of problems teachers face. I'd worked for only two principals in all my years of teaching and both were the kind who let you pretty much alone to do what you thought best. I'd just assumed that that was the way principals are!

Undoubtedly, adjustment to the new position was further complicated by the fact that the initial group of consultants were given few operational guidelines. The most commonly repeated admonition they received was that "Until we see how things go, we can only guess at what the problems and answers may be, so you will have to play it by ear." Consequently, each difficulty encountered became a matter of sorting out what was inherently a characteristic of the new job, and what was simply a reflection of the consultant's or intern's idiosyncracies. For each consultant the question: "Do I feel this way just because I am new to this job, or because I'm what I am, or is this a part of the job itself?" underlay many of their early uncertainties and anxieties. Thus,

> . . . it is during the first part of the year when you feel so frustrated. You have to learn to know the people with whom you are working and I

> mean building principals as well as intern teachers. You have to learn how they operate, what they expect from you and what you can expect from them. You have to just keep trying until you find these things out. You can get your feelings hurt, as one day a principal will be very friendly and the next day you get an icy look. You have to learn that it may have nothing to do with your work, but that he is busier one time than another. Once you build these relationships—and I can't emphasize too strongly that it takes time, sometimes all Fall—then the satisfactions of the job begin to outweigh the frustrations.

Or again,

> If I had been given half a chance I would have resigned at several different times before Christmas. My own inexperience, especially in directing the teaching activities of others, and having to stand back and wait out the high level of confidence with which the interns began the year was terribly frustrating. You felt you should do more, try again, but you didn't know how much you should really expect of the interns, or if what you were doing was enough or too much. If someone had told me "Go do this," I think at that time I would have felt a sense of relief. It is those first months; you don't know what to expect and no one can tell you. You have to work it out for yourself.

While few specific directives were given the first group of consultants, both the University and school staff did have several general expectations. The University hoped that the consultants, in addition to providing the services of a "helping teacher," would also aid the interns in analyzing their classroom situation and encourage them to relate previous formal study to their day-to-day teaching. The school system expected the consultants to maintain standards within the intern's classrooms, even though the class was the intern's. This charge was important for public relations reasons, if for no other, since the interns held special state certification. If an intern came under attack from parents or others, the presence of the consultant in the classroom would be a first line of defense. While consultants were to maintain standards, it was also made clear they were not to infringe on the building principal's authority: The consultants were not to assume any direct role in the evaluation of the intern nor were they to make final recommendations for the retention or advancement of their interns. Building principals could confer with them on these matters; but the final decision was the principal's, as it was on all other matters which involved the intern's performance in his building. Thus, both the University and school cast the consultant as an "expert," but gave her only the power of persuasion to enforce her "expertness."

The building principals readily accepted the consultant's "expertness" though there were exceptions—especially in instances where the consultant had formerly been a classroom teacher in the principal's school. The consultants discovered that they were suddenly called on to advise established teachers and building principals not only about the interns, but also about many other matters. The consultant was "fair game" for anyone who might catch her in the hall or teacher's lounge:

> It was certainly surprising to me at first, and disturbing too, that some of the really experienced teachers, people who have taught longer than I have, and people whom I've always respected for their ability, would come up and ask questions and assume I had an answer. I understand now that everyone is constantly questioning, "Am I doing the right thing?" So I understand now they want someone to listen to them, to assure them, just as the interns do, more than they want answers.

If others were quite prepared to recognize the special competence of the consultants, they themselves were not. They stressed the recency of their own classroom teaching. The self-image with which most of the new intern consultants came to the job was that of a teacher who, along with a group of peers, works with children in a specific school building. While they were loyal to the school system in which they were employed, the consultants, typically, had not been intimately concerned with the affairs of the larger system aside from involvement in committees for curriculum improvement. (There were exceptions: two consultants had been active in the leadership of professional organizations and two had served as assistant principals.) The consultants' sense of "belonging" had come primarily from the close-knit set of face-to-face relations that exist among the teachers within a single building and, even more importantly, from the very special quality of the relationships that exist between a teacher and a group of young children. The new consultants did not see themselves as more knowledgeable about system-wide policy or teaching itself than the majority of their fellow teachers.

Thus, the consultants had to learn to work comfortably as both a system representative and as a teacher of adults rather than of children. This was not always an easy adjustment. The consultants had been accustomed to working in the midst of adults rather than with them. Relationships among teachers are typically either social in nature or appropriate among independent co-equals assigned a common task. As a rule, teachers learn not to pass open judgments on the work of their colleagues or to offer unsolicited suggestions. And even when invited, suggestions tend to be offered indirectly. (As one of the interns put it, "teachers never seem to come right out and tell you what they are really thinking but let you guess what they have on their minds.") Also, many teachers guard jealously their relationship with their own pupils and the full sweep of that relationship is revealed only in the privacy of the classroom. Most teachers carefully avoid working directly with another's pupils, and except for emergencies, are careful not to challenge another teacher's authority, whatever their private view of that teacher's competency. (Some of the interns were to learn this folkway with difficulty; some sought to continue their old relationship with pupils who had passed on to a higher grade—to their regret.) The new position required the consultant to break with these habitual patterns of relating to other teachers and to other teachers' children. A working relationship had to be developed with the intern and with her pupils which would permit the consultant to be a "second teacher in the room" without diminishing the authority of the intern. At the same time the consultant was expected to direct the intern's teaching and take ultimate responsibility for it.

Not only did the consultants find these new demands personally uncomfortable, but the interns often were reluctant to recognize their expertness. In many important ways the first groups of interns were similar to the students who followed them, but in one significant way they differed: they were the "pioneers." As we have already seen, an *espirit* developed which facilitated the formation of a consensus among the interns. Collectively, the first interns had been subjected to the mistakes that arise in initiating any new program. As a group they had felt great pressure as pre-interns—much of it internally produced but much of it a reflection of the concern of campus personnel and of the resident coordinators—to prove themselves as individuals and as teachers and to demonstrate to skeptics that the STEP program was a "superior way to prepare teachers." The first interns felt that they had passed their tests under fire, and indeed, for the most part, they had. As they began their internship the students were confident that they had little need for further help, particularly from individuals who were themselves fresh from the classroom. Many interns agreed with the student who told us that she anticipated her biggest problem during the intern year would be

> . . . the supervisor (consultant) I have to have. I've already been a guest in another teacher's classroom for a year. I want to have my own room and do things my own way. I don't want another supervising teacher and as I see it that is what the intern supervisor will be like.

The interns were very appreciative of the help they had received from their supervising teachers during their pre-internship year, and most planned to model their own performance on one or another of these teachers. But they felt they had earned, and wanted, autonomy. Moreover, the interns believed that the consultant might be some new kind of "spy" acting either for the University, the building principal, or the central school administration. Assurances to the contrary were not fully accepted:

> . . . I don't really believe that the intern supervisors we will have next year aren't going to be coming to snoop around. You all say they aren't, but I'm not sure I believe it. I really dread having to have another supervisor. We've had so many already: the principal, the superintendent, and you people here on campus.

This, then, was the situation the first consultants faced as they took up their new positions: a charge which asked them to take responsibility for maintaining standards and which called on them to move the interns beyond routine levels of performance, but which gave them no real authority; a sense of doubt about their own "expertness"; a style more appropriate for work with young children; and, most important of all, an essentially negative expectation on the part of their main clientele—the interns.

Consultants who have joined the program later also have had to adjust to this same set of interacting factors. The main difference is that the later groups have been forewarned by the older consultants:

> I have written down three warnings for the new consultants. First, be prepared for a considerable amount of defensiveness on the part of the intern teachers, at least early in the year. Second, be prepared for a high level of confidence in themselves and a corresponding resistance to change, again, at least early in the year. Third, be prepared for your intern to demonstrate a fierce loyalty to one or another of the supervising teachers with whom she has worked and to be suspicious of you and your methods, especially if they happen to be different from those of the supervising teacher.

Given these conditions, the initial response of the consultants was to back away from establishing a "supervisory" relationship in the usual sense, and to seek the safer ground of a nondirective colleague relationship with their interns. In the short run, the consultants' hesitance to assume a more directive stance—while based on a reasonable assessment of their situation—was a source of anxiety for members of the staff and, we suspect, for the consultants as well. The fear was that the interns would "use" the consultants as clerks and errand runners. There was some basis for this concern. For example, in the beginning some interns put aside records or pupil evaluation forms "to keep the consultants out of their hair" or they made lists of materials they needed and asked the consultant to secure or prepare them. The interns appeared to be trying to reestablish the relationship they had enjoyed with their supervising teachers during their pre-internship year; only now the roles were reversed!

But in the long run the consultant's decision to adopt a nondirective approach and to play along with the initial attempt to dismiss them turned out well. For time was on the consultant's side. Eventually all but a few of the interns backed themselves into a corner of one kind or another—some in their classroom practice, and others in their relations with principals or fellow teachers—and the interns made it clear that they were ready to accept more significant help. The time spent waiting for such a "breakthrough" to occur—for the intern to become "teachable"—was not wasted; during this trying period the consultant had an opportunity to study her intern's children and the dynamics of the classroom, and to establish her presence in the intern's building. When the intern was ready to accept help—help that went beyond the provision of materials and the completion of clerical tasks—the consultants were ready to provide it.

Especially for the first group of interns in each center, the wait for a "breakthrough" was sometimes agonizingly long, and in some instances it never really came. In succeeding years, the intern's acceptance came sooner as the consultants gained confidence and as the expectations of the interns became more positive. But some period of watchful waiting appears to be a necessary prerequisite to the establishment of a "successful" consultant-internship relationship, if success means a relationship in which the consultant's suggestions will be acted upon by the intern.

During the period of watchful waiting, both consultants and interns sent out feelers. The consultants made it a point to do graciously whatever the interns asked of them, no matter how routine, so long as the requests were not disrespectful. The consultants worked on records, graded papers, and helped with problem children. Meanwhile, the consultants tried to make it clear to the interns that they were available to talk over more important concerns. For their part, interns put their consultants to a test. Interns reported incidents where they had "maneuvered" their consultant into taking over the class for a day—though the consultant was usually a willing "victim"—so that the intern could appraise the expertness of the consultant. Another common testing device seemed to be that of telling the consultant something in confidence and then waiting to see who, if anyone, acquired knowledge of the "secret." More frequently the testing was not so deliberate. Some incident would occur which would cause the intern to reassess her consultant. For example, the intern might run afoul of a building principal or a parent and the consultant might defend the intern. Or the consultant would take over the class and the obvious change in the pupils' behavior would make the intern question her earlier negative judgment of the consultant's competence. In their testing, interns appeared to be asking two questions: "Is this consultant really more skillful than I am (or than my supervising teacher was last year?) and is this consultant really loyal *to me?"* Once these tests were passed, guidance of the intern could begin; where they failed, either a new consultant eventually had to be found or a non-productive relationship continued.

There were, of course, many exceptions. Some interns accepted their consultant almost from the first; some consultants did not share the majority view of the need for a nondirective relationship. There were interns who left their consultants no alternative but that of tight supervision. But we are describing modal patterns and due allowances for some oversimplification must be made.

Thus, despite these exceptions, it turned out that even though the consultant's position had originally been projected as a supervisory one, the interaction of the factors we have been detailing make a non-directive working style desirable. Once this style became established as precedent, it persisted, even though the circumstances which brought it into being moderated with succeeding classes of interns.

As it worked out, the ambiguity of the consultant's authority was viewed as a major source of strength in the position, an advantage rather than a disadvantage. The beginning teacher, whether an intern or a graduate of an on-campus program, works under many conflicting pressures. She is, on the one hand, searching for new ideas as she tries out alternative ways of doing things. On the other hand, because of her inexperience and her uncertainty about what is "right" and "good," and because she is still on trial, the beginner is easily threatened by critical questions from outsiders. The new teacher is amenable to suggestions since her teaching style has not yet crystallized, but at the same time is often fearful of taking problems to others. A friendly principal, a kindly or understanding colleague can sometimes overcome the defenses of the beginner and establish a bond based on mutual trust and respect. But these persons have other duties and, in the principal's case, are responsible for evaluating the beginner.

The consultant, on the other hand, was a regular visitor in the intern's classroom. This meant that she saw the intern on good days as well as bad ones; the consultants saw much that was genuinely praiseworthy. When crises arose, the consultant's intervention was not as threatening as identical action would have been coming from persons who had only sporadic contacts with the intern. But most importantly the consultant had *to win* authority, it did not come automatically with her position.

For the most part the consultants succeeded in establishing productive relationships. Many of the interns told us that in the first weeks they had dreaded the consultant's visits, and had insisted on knowing when the consultants would appear so that they could make special preparations. Eventually this proved unnecessary and too much bother and both interns and pupils grew accustomed to having the consultant drop in unannounced as well as on her regular schedule. Once the consultant had earned the trust of the intern, many informal contacts developed: a sudden visit in which the consultant might just leave materials and where a moment or two would be stolen to talk things over; an evening phone call from the intern to the consultant; a hurried conference before a building or city-wide faculty meeting. In some cases, brief daily interchanges of this sort were achieved in contexts which were less formidable than the regularly scheduled visit.

Obviously the consultants did not succeed in establishing a free and fluid relationship with each of their interns. Sometimes a building principal or an older teacher became the intern's chief support and resource person, and the consultant's services became redundant. Some interns preferred to work through their problems alone. As we shall see, building policy sometimes made an easy relationship with an intern difficult to establish. But despite the presence of many unknowns which might determine whether a particular consultant would succeed with a particular intern, the consultants still felt it possible to describe the qualifications they felt were required to succeed in the position. This description included the following main items:

1. The intern consultant must be a person able to win the intern's respect by demonstrating, in actual practice, that she is a superior teacher. Persons who relied on status, authority or position alone to win respect were seldom accorded it. The more successful consultants appeared to be those who were willing to "get their hands dirty"; to illustrate their suggestions by demonstration.

2. The intern consultant must be a person able to win the intern's trust. This meant that she must be able not only to guard confidences but also the privacy of events that she observed in the intern's classroom and which might have reflected unfavorably on the intern had they become known.

3. The intern consultant must be a person flexible enough to adapt to a variety of grades, school settings, and individual personalities and be able to resist substituting her own concerns for those of her intern. The real test came in being able to shift from one intern to another in both the pacing and the substance of the

guidance offered. Flexibility appeared to require an ability to analyze each teaching situation *on its own terms* and not in reference to some formal conception of what "good" teaching ought to be. Each of the interns was striving to find a style consistent with her own view of teaching and her assessment of her own abilities and the situation in which she found herself. The consultant, if she wished to succeed, had to be perceptive enough, first of all, to determine the kind of teacher that the intern wished to become and wise enough to help the intern achieve that goal even though it might conflict with what the consultant herself valued.

4. The consultant must have that level of psychological security that would make it possible for her to accept strength in the intern as well as weakness. The consultants, as a group, were chosen because of their proven ability to work with children but that ability does not necessarily transfer to the establishment of comfortable working relationships with adults. Consultants were not immune to professional jealousy and while weakness in an intern was easy to tolerate, strength was sometimes more difficult to accept. Especially since their position was that of an "expert," some consultants felt duty-bound to change the intern's practice even when the intern proved herself to be a superior teacher from the start.

The above description makes no mention of any required special technical knowledge. If the consultant did not have special competence in an area of concern to her intern, this reduced the chance for a productive relationship, of course. But aside from avoiding obvious mistakes in pairing consultants and interns—as, for example, assigning a consultant with only primary grade experience to an intern in a junior high grade—it is impossible to state in advance *what* special proficiencies a consultant must possess. An important characteristic of the internship is the unpredictability of the occurrences which will arise to test a given intern and her consultant. A retarded child transferring into the intern's room in the middle of the year, a change in the reading program, a series of tornado alerts, and similar accidental events can alter drastically the intern's teaching situation and the special knowledge that will be demanded of the consultant. But while consultants reasonably might be expected to be competent in some special area, the particular knowledge that might be most useful cannot be specified. In STEP, the consultants were given time to acquire any necessary information they did not have and they were free to call upon the talents of other members of the consultant team in their center, or on the services of University staff.

As with most job descriptions, the one just given identifies an ideal person who would be difficult to find. But the description is useful in suggesting the goals the consultants set for themselves. In our view, there is much to recommend the consultants' definition of their role. For they recognize that teaching is essentially an art form and not a science. And this recognition diminished temptations to resort to formalistic prescriptions in answering the questions of beginning teachers, or to substitute textbook maxims for demonstration and hard reasoning about the actual conditions each intern encountered.

By acknowledging the highly individualistic character of the teaching act, the consultants also made it clear that they wished to resist imposing stereotypic responses. It is, after all, possible to "keep school" by relying on the many guides and syllabi available to the beginner and the institutional pressures for conformity inherent in any school system make this response attractive. By their definitions, the consultants indicated that they wished to place themselves in a position to work against the premature crystallization of routine teaching habits.

The consultants attached considerable importance to their function as sympathetic listeners. By doing so, they hoped to guard their interns against the isolation that can occur when a beginning teacher finds herself in a school situation where the discussion of teaching is not encouraged. There are schools where the faculty sees itself engaged in an exciting joint enterprise, and where teachers discuss their children and their teaching in the lounge and over lunch. But there are other schools where it is socially incorrect ever to talk about one's work. In such a school a beginner, eager to win acceptance, can find herself isolated as a teacher, however congenial the faculty might otherwise be. Moreover, even seasoned teachers, recognized for their work with children, cannot always explain in any coherent or consistent fashion what it is that they are about, and why. (Some of the consultants, themselves, found this a problem at first.) The phenomena may be simply a function of the fact that teachers are seldom asked to analyze their practice. The consultants hoped that by being available and by encouraging a dialogue they could help the interns make the basis of their practice more explicit.

If only the consultant and her intern had been involved, the establishment of the desired working relationship and the achievement of the goals that relationship implied would have been relatively easy. But a school is, of course, more than just a single teacher in her classroom. In addition to the factors which have largely dominated the discussion to this point, there were a set of other variables—more sociological in nature—which set limits on what it was possible for the consultant and intern to accomplish together.

C. THE EFFECTS OF THE BUILDING MILIEU ON THE INTERN-CONSULTANT RELATIONSHIP

The intern began teaching with a highly egocentric view of her school milieu. To be sure, like most teachers, she wanted to win the personal approval of her building principal and fellow teachers. But the intern often minimized the impact that her colleagues' assessment of her behavior, within as well as outside her classroom, could have on her own practice. The intern's enthusiasm at finally having her own pupils and her concern to refine skills acquired in the pre-internship, partially hid from view the existence of informal but potent norm-setting mechanisms within the building. Partly, too, the reluctance of teachers to interfere openly in the practice of a fellow teacher obscured the many indirect pressures that teachers can bring to bear: the shrug in response to a parent's question about an intern; the unavailability of materials that must be shared; the silence in the teacher's lounge.

Especially the younger interns without previous work experience sometimes only slowly sensed that the standards now being applied to evaluate their behavior differed from those which had governed in the student culture they had just left. Complaints about "giggleness," chattering about after-school personal life, irresponsibility, excessive "kidding," and similar forms of "immature" behavior were frequent, though these criticisms were transmitted to the intern consultant rather than to the intern herself. At this level, the standards to which the intern was expected to conform were those young people encounter on entering any adult occupation. But such complaints, though frequent initially, did not persist. With few exceptions, the new interns came to appreciate, if they had not been already aware of the fact, that the impulsiveness and openness that had won approval from student peers was not so highly valued by teachers. One intern, for example, shortly after beginning her internship, confessed that she found the teachers in her building somber and dull and was disappointed that they showed so little interest when she told them about the exciting new things she was doing with her youngsters. This intern, who later left the program, misunderstood the silence of her colleagues who, the consultant later informed us, resented the intern's departure from the planned sequence of instruction.

Failure to meet accepted standards of dress and speech, being most visible, were especially likely to be noted, as was any lack of concern for such other elements of middle-class manners and belief as cleanliness in pupils, thrift with teaching materials, and religiosity. The dominant feminine atmosphere of the elementary school placed a premium, also, on sociability and pupil nurturance and failure to meet expectations on these counts could bring an intern into disfavor. Given the social origins of the STEP interns, and the proportion of men among them, many of the interns encountered problems in sensing building norms. Unfavorable comparisons with other beginning teachers who had been graduated from regular training programs were not infrequent.

But serious and lasting problems arising from the interns' failure to conform to adult work, class, and sex expectations proved an exception. Most of the girls took on the social manner of the teachers around them and the transformation was rapid. It was interesting to note, for example, how even when the interns did not have money for new clothes, the way they chose to wear their old ones quickly changed. Moreover, the intern often accepted help from her consultant on matters of dress and speech, even during the period when she rejected guidance on teaching *per se.* Changes in value-orientations came more slowly, but here too, internalization of the dominant view of the teachers in the intern's building was the rule. The men among the interns had a more difficult adjustment to make, but they too, gradually took on the role most often assigned the male teacher (though not the administrator) in the elementary school: that of a tolerated, but detached non-participant in the informal organization. Many of the men found it advantageous to develop some special activity—an after-school recreation program, or a science club, for example—which would accord them both a unique status and some measure of independence from the pressures of the dominant feminine group. Conformity to work, class, and sex norms, then, usually resulted once the intern became aware of any disparity between his own behavior and that expected of him.

More significant pressures for conformity and more troublesome problems in acculturation stemmed from the essential ambiguity of teaching as an occupation. Teaching is assumed to be a profession by most teachers and school administrators, and the appropriateness of behavior is evaluated against standards believed to distinguish the professional. Thus, one of the hallmarks of a profession is a large measure of autonomy. This freedom to decide is justified by the expertness that presumably has been acquired in the training program. The individual teacher is expected to know what is right, not in just a general way, but in the sense also that she will make the proper decisions in specific situations which arise. Implicit in this assumption of autonomy is the expectation that the teacher will take personal responsibility for the consequences of her actions and will have a highly developed capacity for self-discipline. But this view of teaching, so commonly given lip service, was often at variance with the reality the intern encountered, and the intern who acted as though the myth were true could find herself in grave difficulties.

The actual autonomy accorded a teacher is usually quite limited and, what is more important, the nature of the constraints that will be imposed in a particular building are not always predictable, since there can be considerable disparity between what is proclaimed and what is practiced. An intern may be told, for example, that the maintenance of close ties with parents is highly valued, only to discover when she initiates such contacts that this is seen by her fellow teachers as a form of self-advertising, or that the building principal insists on monitoring all visits with parents because of his concern for the school's public image. Or again, there are schools where the teacher is told that she must express her own personality in her teaching, but where uniformity is quietly enforced through the requirement of detailed lesson plans and standard texts. There are, on the other hand, schools where teachers are led to believe that they must teach certain subjects at certain times of the day, but teachers who ignore or circumvent the restriction as they see fit are rewarded for doing so.

Other canons of "professionalism" are applied as ambiguously as the strictures about autonomy. For our discussion, the significant point is that the intern often had difficulty knowing what was myth and what was reality in advance of some crisis in which the conflict between the two became apparent.

Even in the many situations in which the gap between avowal and practice of professional standards is narrow, a parallel ambiguity can arise because of the lack of universally accepted criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching. The teacher is expected to know what is right, but what is actually so viewed by the principal and/or the dominant group of teachers in a particular building is neither always apparent, nor consistent with formal statements of policy. Moreover, unlike the new doctor, for example, the new teacher has no independent standard against which she can test her own competence. For the doctor, patients either recover or die, and individual recovery rates can be compared with those known to obtain generally. But even if the teacher can show that her pupils have mastered an assigned body of subject matter—the most operational of the many criteria of effectiveness—she may find that the worth of this criterion is itself challenged. Self-evaluation is even less certain if the objectives to be attained are less directly observable, as they most often are. As a result, a new teacher may be quite satisfied with her own performance and find it consistent with what she has been taught is desirable, only to find that in her school this criterion is not honored. Nor is the criterion which is applied always clear.

Success and failure in a given building may be determined on such grounds as the quietness or bustle of the pupils, on the strictness or permissiveness with which rules are enforced, on the presence or absence of room displays, on whether slow or advanced pupils are given priority, or on whether emphasis is given to reading rather than social studies, or art rather than science. Against the application of idiosyncratic, arbitrary and sometimes hidden standards the new teacher has little recourse.

Beyond these two ambiguities, which exist in some measure for all new teachers, a special problem in adjustment faced the intern which accrued simply from her special group membership as an "intern." Acceptance of an intern appeared to be inversely related to an established teacher's opportunity for personal contact. Thus, secondary school teachers were more often critical of the interns than were elementary school teachers. And, to illustrate further, in one L-shaped elementary school building the teachers in the wing where an intern was stationed were more favorably disposed to her than were those in the other wing. (To be sure, teachers in the two wings were at odds about a great deal more than just the intern.)

The student who felt her competency being challenged sometimes found it impossible to satisfy her critic even if she wished to do so, since what was being attacked was the internship program itself. This was not always clear either to the intern or her critic, for there was often a difference between the manifest and latent basis of rejection. Thus, while teachers voiced fears that teaching standards were being lowered, they often were more concerned that the internship program, by increasing the supply of available teachers, would weaken the teachers' leverage on the school board at contract renewal time. In each instance where members of the central office staff explained the program to teacher organizations—and this was true of appearances at meetings of both AFL-CIO and NEA affiliates—initial criticism of the interns' preparation gave way to endorsements of the pedagogical soundness of the program. After all, the program went a long way in meeting long-standing grievances that teachers have about their own training. The program gave established teachers more to say about the preparation of those entering the profession, and it emphasized the practical aspects of teaching. On the other hand, while the economic fears were quieted, they were never put completely to rest even though it was pointed out that school boards could not save money by employing interns. This answer did not suffice where teacher morale was low. Attacks on the internship program in any given center paralleled the rise and fall of the teachers' satisfaction with their conditions of employment. For example, in two cities where millage increases to support salary raises were turned down, the number of open criticisms of the program and of interns in it (never large in any case) increased, but in one of these where a second vote carried, organized attacks on the program diminished. The internship program and the intern, thus, were sometimes used as scapegoats for the expression of general dissatisfactions existing within a building or a school system. Against such scapegoating the intern had little defense.

To summarize, then, in contrast to the relatively minor difficulties the interns encountered in adjusting to work, class and sex expectations, problems involving their professional behavior, the informal evaluation of their effectiveness as teachers, and their special group membership as interns were more difficult to handle.

Only a minority of the interns encountered serious difficulties. By and large, the teachers and principals with whom they were in closest contact accepted them. Moreover, as a group, the interns sought to conform. If we choose to explore the problem of milieu further, this does not mean that every intern, or the program itself, faced an unending series of challenges. It is rather that the problem cases highlight the essential issues that arise in the operation of an internship—issues that are muted in the majority of uneventful inductions.

In helping the interns cope with their milieu, the liaison function of the intern consultant assumed an importance which had not been fully anticipated when the position was first conceived. It had been foreseen that the consultant would be called upon to explain the intern and her training to established teachers and building principals and to interpret system-wide and building policies to her interns. But a much more active intervention was required where the intern found herself at odds with other teachers or with her principal. In such instances the consultant's first and preferred response was to attempt to mediate the differences. But mediation was not always possible, and in crisis situations, the consultant faced the necessity of siding with or against the intern:

> The principal at M—— called me and told me to come in to see her about Tom. It seems a parent had called the principal about a child in Tom's room. Tom was disturbed and angry that the principal had not referred the parent to him, and he had told the office secretary and principal off about it. The principal wanted to make it clear to me that she had supported Tom, not threatened him, or put him in bad with the parent. But this was just one of many flare-ups. So I've kind of been a buffer between them all year. I'm not sure Tom understands my position. I'm sure he thinks I've not given him the backing he expected. Tom wants to move to another school next year and I hope he can.

Whether or not a consultant chose to support his intern in any interpersonal confrontation depended, of course, on the consultant's feelings of personal security, the extent of her identification with established teachers or the principal, and on many similar factors. We choose to focus our discussion, however, on two variables whose operation may not be so obvious: (a) the consultant's assessment of whether the breakdown stemmed from the intern's essential strength or weakness as a teacher, and (b) the extent to which the building principal delegated authority to the consultant.

Some interns were slow in learning to cope with the classroom situations to which they were assigned. Yet as long as their shortcomings were not too extreme, and if the intern was otherwise personally acceptable, partial failure with the children did not necessarily result in the intern's rejection by established teachers. Unless failure in the classroom accompanied marked irresponsibility—laxness in supervising children in the halls or on the playground, slowness in returning materials needed by other teachers—it was usually tolerated. When asked, more experienced teachers even proved quite willing to help the weak intern and were generous in providing materials and in offering suggestions for handling problem children. Rejection of an intern more frequently occurred when the intern was most "successful" with her children or their parents. Thus, the intern who stayed long hours to prepare fresh and exciting materials for her class was as often censured as praised. The intern who won compliments from her children's parents was more likely to be isolated than the one who did not. And, most especially, the intern who departed from building norms out of conviction and who could defend her position more often found herself in difficulties with her fellow teachers than one whose practice was routine and unexamined. For despite the intern's inferior status and inexperience, commitment engendered professional jealousy and rejection as often as it did commendation and acceptance.

Strength in an intern was judged, of course, in relation to the performance of other faculty members in the intern's building. Where the intern was surrounded by time-servers, by those who had succumbed to the comfort of routine, or by those who had given up trying in a difficult situation, otherwise unremarkable performance in an intern tended to be overvalued by the consultants, principals, and by the interns themselves. And, as it worked out, a number of conditions combined to increase the likelihood that interns would find themselves stationed in such schools. In most STEP centers, as in school systems generally, superior teaching is rewarded by transfer within the system rather than by advancement in salary or position. Teachers move from the older building to the newer one, from the central city school to that next door to suburbia, from the more difficult to the easier teaching situation. The result was that more intern stations became available in the "less desirable" schools, and in these schools an intern's enthusiasm and recent training could compensate for her lack of experience, and her performance often compared most favorably with that of the teachers around her.

As members of a training program, and given the goals they had set for themselves, the consultants were inclined, of course, to encourage the strong intern even when such support brought them both into conflict with established teachers. But the consultant's evaluation of her intern's ability as a teacher was not the sole determinant. Interacting with that assessment, the decision to support a nonconformist was also affected by the extent to which the principal delegated authority for the supervision of the intern to the consultant.

As originally conceived, the consultants were to supplement, not replace, the building principal in the supervision of the intern. It was expected that building principals would want to provide whatever help they normally offered to a beginning teacher, and the principal's responsibility for evaluating the work of the intern was made quite explicit. And for the most part, these expectations were warranted. But given the work load of the typical elementary school principal, many happily transferred their responsibility for supervision to the consultants, even to the point, in an extreme case, where contact between the intern and principal was limited to the social chitchat of the coffee break. Typical of many of her colleagues was the consultant who told us:

> Two of my five principals have literally turned over their interns to me. I really feel that neither of them really knows what is going on in the intern's room. I think that is too bad, though, because I think both would be pleasantly surprised. And I think the girls would have been more willing to make changes if they felt some pressure from their principals. One of the principals says that next year he wants to move in and do more supervision on his own. But he now thinks things get done better this way, with me in charge, that progress comes more quickly. I'm not sure. This goes back, of course, to the whole question of how much I can impose myself. The principal can impose his wishes on the intern, while because of the delicacy of my relationship with the girls it is really much harder for me to impose myself.

To the extent that the consultant became her intern's surrogate principal, some limitation on the consultant's freedom of action resulted, even where the intern encountered no major problems in adapting to her milieu. Thus, for example, principals sometimes requested formal progress reports from the consultants. In such sessions the consultant often had to draw a fine line between describing that which the principal needed to know and that which (while it may also have been very important information for the principal) might violate an intern's confidences. Where this line was crossed, the viability of the intern-consultant relationship could be destroyed. One way out of the dilemma was for the consultant to avoid becoming a confidante. But this course of action diminished the likelihood that the preferred relationship would be established with the intern.

A much more difficult situation resulted when the intern chose to challenge existing norms. Consultants knew, of course, that occasions would arise in which a choice might have to be made between the needs of the intern and the interests of the school. One of the consultants described the conflict in these words:

> If I had only loyalty to the STEP program I would simply let the interns plow their own furrow, let them make all their mistakes, and then at the point where they want me to, move in and work with them. If my entire loyalty were to the school system, the action would have to be more quick and direct. I don't think I have any interns who are actually harming the children but there are maybe some who ought to be let go even if the chances are that in time they'll come around. So in this way, I feel that I'm caught up between two sets of loyalties.

But the possibility of a clash in loyalties did not occur only when the interns were "weak." An intern whose strength threatened the more established teachers could pose a similar problem for the consultant:

> Frankly right now I think K—— is a very good teacher. She is in a difficult situation, a lower-class school with difficult children. She has provided her children with all kinds of experiences—things that none of the other teachers in that building have done for their children. My main reservation is about her relationships with the other teachers. She is feeling very, very confident about her own teaching and I think she has a condescending attitude toward some of the others. I blame myself, partly, for this because I tried for such a long time to help her build confidence and I think I may have overtaught it. She's in a building with a lot of older teachers, some of them just waiting to retire. She's constantly comparing what she's doing with what they're doing. I guess all teachers do that, but she's doing a good job and she can see that she is, but so can the others, and she is endangering her relations with the other teachers in the building in the process. Frankly, right now I don't know how to handle it. I don't want her to slack up; but I don't want her to get all of the others on her either.

Where an intern misinformed her pupils, showed prejudice, or otherwise threatened the welfare of children, the consultant moved to affect a change or to remove the intern from the program irrespective of any other consideration. But often, where the intern was "strong," an increase in the consultant's supervisory responsibilities made it more probable that she would attempt to forestall challenges to existing norms or where such challenges could not be prevented, that she would withhold her support from the intern. Where she might otherwise have encouraged a strong intern to take an independent course, or have permitted a weak intern to persist in the hope of learning from failure, as a surrogate principal the consultant demanded compliance. And, in fact, in this position the consultant was often more insistent on obtaining conformity than the principal.

An increase in the supervisory duties of the consultant sometimes resulted from a partial abdication by the building principal; but some consultants chose to emphasize their supervisory function even in the absence of a compelling reason for doing so. Thus, one consultant who had served as a building principal knew what was and was not valued in her school system. With the best intentions, she insisted that her interns meet these system expectations, even though there were no pressures in this direction exerted from within the intern's building, and even though these demands were not those which the intern could meet comfortably. But whatever the reason, to the extent that the consultant's supervisory responsibilities increased, the likelihood that she would support the non-conforming intern was diminished. And to this extent, as well, the likelihood that the potential of the consultantship would be realized was also reduced.

Premature pressure for change or insistence on conformity served to inhibit the development of the non-directive intern-consultant relationship. During the early period of the internship, however, the effects of such a departure from the preferred relationship were not usually critical. But eventually the intern reached a point in her development where she was confident, and realistically so, about her ability to teach. She had learned how to proceed in teaching what was expected of her at her particular grade level; she could anticipate the needs and reactions of the children to whom she had been assigned; she had accumulated a stock of materials and ideas for motivating children; she knew whom to see for the special services she required. The intern had become, in short, an adequate teacher. She could "keep school" with no more than the usual quota of crises. When the intern reached this point varied, of course. A few interns seemed to operate at this level almost from their first day, and most reached this point before the end of their first year. Once adequacy was attained, the character of the intern-consultant relationship which had been established became a crucial factor in determining if further development of the intern would occur.

Most of the pressures that come into play in the induction of an elementary school teacher are those that make for conformity. Of course, elementary schools are not unique in this respect. But the pressures for conformity may be even greater here than in other institutions. Those who enter the occupation are, as a group, more conformist to begin with than are students choosing other fields. In addition, normal institutional pressures are exaggerated due to the predominance of women who require stability so that teaching can be combined comfortably with their other major role: that of being a wife and mother. Consequently, the wonder was not that so many of the interns were satisfied once they had acquired a minimum command of their job, but that some were not. And this, we believe, brings us to what must surely be the central problem for programs like STEP in particular and for internship programs generally: With a premium placed on conformity, what is to serve as a spur for further development once the intern has achieved control of her immediate situation?

In the early months of the internship, where necessary, compliance could be demanded by the consultant, building principal, or both. But once an acceptable level of performance was achieved, still further development depended on the intern's accepting the need. As one consultant expressed it:

> Until the intern sees for herself that there is need for something more than what she is doing, neither demonstrations nor suggestions are effective. They get in the way of working with the intern, and she shuts you out. You don't gain a thing pushing ideas for which people aren't ready.

For a few students, readiness to go beyond acceptable levels of practice appeared to be internally engendered. There were those who had entered teacher preparation with clearly differentiated ideas of what they wished to be as teachers, or who had developed these concepts during their pre-internship. There was, to illustrate, the intern who had left an occupation in which she was established and successful because of her deep interest in ideas for their own sake and who wished to share her enthusiasm with children. Since routine was her personal enemy, new approaches to teaching suggested by the consultant, or anyone else for that matter, were eagerly seized on. There were, in addition, interns who seemed to catch fire in the course of the internship itself as did the student who, assigned to a difficult school, saw the apathy of her pupils and fellow teachers as a personal challenge. Her talent as an artist provided her with an avenue by which she broke through to her pupils, and this triumph was the beginning of a basic re-evaluation of her purpose as a teacher. In this, she credited her consultant with an important part; there was no one in the building prepared to listen.

For other students a shift in school assignments appeared to be the motivating force for continued growth. Thus one intern spoke of the effects that a transfer from a school where expectations were minimal had had on her satisfaction with her own performance. In this instance, the greater demands stemmed from a change in the social background of her pupils. The rather simple devices that had succeeded before in arousing her pupils' interests and in satisfying her desire to be needed by them no longer sufficed. Where before a visit of a local museum had been an exciting and enriching event for her class, now it was not. To recapture that early sense of fulfillment, to have something to give to her new class, required an expansion of her own resources and skill.

Readiness to go beyond the ordinary sometimes resulted from a fortunate placement in a school where the principal and/or teachers themselves responded to innovation and experimentation, or where the parents demanded a superior level of performance. In such a setting, even the student who originally saw teaching as just another job found it difficult not to become involved in the search for something more. Ideally, of course, one would hope to place interns only in such schools. But this is not a realistic possibility for a program which, like STEP, aimed to train relatively large numbers of students. Only a limited number of interns can be placed in a given school (a reasonable limit seems to us to be about 10% of the teaching stations in a school) and the number of schools of the character we have just described are too few to support a large-scale internship program.

Assuming readiness in the intern, the consultant could be important in determining whether higher levels of performance would actually be achieved. Where the interns were responding to the greater demands of a particular school setting—that is, where the motivation for continued growth was essentially extrinsic—the services now demanded of the consultant represented much more than a simple extension of those that she had provided in the early period of the internship. Providing help on technical matters now became less important; helping the intern in examining value choices became more significant. But to provide this new level of help the colleague relationship had to have been already established on a footing which would permit a frank discussion.

The consultant's contribution was even more critical in situations where motivation for further development was essentially intrinsic, and especially where the intern's desire to excel brought her into conflict with other teachers in her milieu. In addition to helping the student with substantive questions, the consultant had to be in a position to support her intern against the many pressures for conformity. But a pre-condition for providing such support was that the consultant's supervisory responsibilities be minimal. The consultant had to feel free to exert a countervailing pressure, sometime even to the point of conducting a campaign to win support from a reluctant principal whose definition of excellence might differ from that of the intern.

We are persuaded that the most important factor shaping both the style and substance of a teacher's performance is the milieu into which she is placed. If students persist, and especially if they remain in the same building, most internalize or accommodate to the views of those in their immediate environment, and especially to the habits of thought and patterns of work of the established teachers. We do not mean that differences do not exist within each building, and that the intern has no choice of teachers with whom she will most closely identify, but that differences between buildings are often greater than those within a single building. The intern has a choice in determining the kind of teacher she will seek to become, but it is a choice circumscribed by the pattern of those immediately around her. Given the motivations which underlie most decisions to prepare as teachers, the limitations of the tested knowledge about the teaching act which can be transmitted in formal training, and institutional requirements for order and efficiency, it is not surprising that the building milieu should be a much more powerful determinant of practice than any formal instruction.

If this analysis is warranted, and where we hope to develop the theme further in reports of our socialization studies, at the very least it seems advisable to reserve some intern stations on a relatively permanent basis. The effect would be that schools where the administrative leadership and faculty are most receptive to innovation, where teachers are granted the greatest autonomy and other professional considerations could be given preference. Unfortunately, such schools, whether in high or low socioeconomic areas, are likely to be the ones with the least turnover and the ones most desired by established teachers who seek transfers.

Our sensitiveness to the importance of the intern's milieu also leads us to recommend against making the internship a *mandatory* requirement for all students at this time. To make it so, as some are suggesting, would mean that many interns, of necessity, would be placed in situations where the interns are unlikely to be extended. It is difficult to see how a general improvement of teacher training could result.

Fortunately, there are exceptions; there are students who do not seek to conform and who do set their sights higher. If our analysis has merit, any administrative measures that would emphasize the consultant's teaching function and decrease her supervisory responsibilities would be advantageous. The use of consultants as resource persons in the instruction of the pre-interns is one such measure. This makes it possible for the consultants to establish their expertness with their future interns and cuts down the initial trial period. But, on the other hand, giving consultants, and even the coordinator, heavy responsibility for formal instruction with its trappings of grades, ratings, and the rest is, in our opinion, unfortunate since it operates against the establishment of the preferred colleague relationship.

In one of the STEP centers, consultants were appointed with the understanding that the position would rotate—that is, consultants would hold the appointment for three years and then return to the classroom or to another post. This is a second example of the kind of administrative arrangement which, in our opinion, would foster the development of the relationship that is most desirable, if the potential of the internship to facilitate the development of the nonconformist is valued. Other things being equal, the farther in time the consultant gets from her own classroom teaching, the more likely it is she will come to insist on some formalistic conception of what a good teacher ought to be, and the less likely she will be to support the intern who has a different view become the teacher the intern wants to become.

The intern consultantship position is, we believe, the key to exploiting the potential inherent in the internship. What is required is the establishment of relationships such that, in the formative years, counterpressures may be exerted against routine and conformity. Whether the internship approach will succeed depends, in our opinion, on the kind of persons who are selected for the consultant position, and whether the administrative arrangements are those that will facilitate or inhibit the consultants' maintenance of an independent presence. Granted that, even if established, this presence will not make a difference for all interns. But the interns for whom it will are to be cherished.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUDING POINTS AND A SUMMARY STATEMENT

A. THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE INTERNSHIP AT MICHIGAN STATE

Michigan State revised its internship program in the summer of 1964 after five years of experience with STEP. Minor changes in the original plans had been made earlier, of course, but rather than detail the evolution of the current program, we will simply describe it and relate the changes to the principal themes of our analysis.

In the revised program, as before, a student completes two years of college and then enrolls for a campus summer session. At the end of the summer, however, not all students move to resident centers. About half of those in each class remain on campus for the regular Fall term; the rest return in the Spring after two quarters in the field. A second summer session follows for both groups.

Formal course requirements are identical for students in the internship and regular programs. But the internship students take their methods of teaching courses in the centers and the course, *School and Society*, after, rather than before, they complete student teaching. The work in teaching methods is presented in a "block" by a "team" of three faculty members commuting from campus, and this study is accompanied by work in the schools, as before. The work in the schools expands into a full-time student teaching experience in the second quarter of the pre-internship.

A two-year internship is no longer mandatory. Following her pre-internship the student completes a single year's internship, although the University may extend the requirement for students who have not reached adequate levels of performance, but give some promise of doing so. Provisions for selecting students, paying the interns, and guiding their practice are similar to those described earlier.

To some extent, the cutback in the internship requirement was a response to a 1963 University-wide reduction in the number of credit hours required for graduation. Other considerations aside, this necessitated an adjustment if the disparity in the demands of the internship and campus program was not to become even wider. But it is highly probable that a change to a one-year internship would have been made in any case. Two groups benefited most from the second year: the less able and those who wished to develop their skills beyond simply acceptable levels. The less able have been provided for by reserving the right to extend the internship requirement in individual instances. For the more committed, an alternative proposal is being considered: the development of a new kind of Master's degree program which will extend the core of the internship idea in a way that might justify the granting of graduate level credit. The teacher would be given an opportunity to work on the improvement of her skill and understanding using her own classroom. University personnel would attempt to provide the kind of guidance that characterized the best of the second-year intern-consultant relationships.

During their internship year the students in the revised program enroll, in extension, in the six-credit course, *School and Society.* In this, the students consider the purposes of education, and analyze the impact of the larger society on their endeavors. The progression in the revised program is, thus, from general and liberal education, to an intensive analysis and practice of teaching, to a critical examination of the aims of education.

The major effect of the changes made in the initial structure is that a student may now certify in four calendar years while still completing both a pre-internship and paid internship in the schools. Though less demanding, the revised program still asks more of the student than does the campus-based program: an added quarter off-campus in addition to student teaching, two summer sessions, and the internship year itself.

There is evidence that the revised program is attractive to students. In the first class enrolled, a larger proportion are students who have completed their first two years at Michigan State rather than at one of the community colleges. Many of these are also students who were in a position to choose the internship option on other than financial grounds. The new program still has little appeal for those who value campus life most highly, but it does make the decision to undertake the internship less difficult for others.

In general, the essential features of the STEP program have been retained and the expectation is that both the opportunities and problems of the longer program will characterize the new one. Some changes are expected, however.

The concentration of the methods courses into a single term should reduce the strength of the early identification of the pre-interns with their established teachers since the amount of correlated work and the student's involvement in the schools will necessarily diminish. Moreover, the priority of formal instruction in the pre-internship will be more clearly visible to the students; the use of the campus-based instructional team should also have this effect. The resident staff should become less vulnerable, too, since the co-ordinators and consultants will not be as intimately involved in formal instruction for which college credit is to be awarded, though they will continue to play a leading role as resource persons in explaining local policy and demonstrating local procedures. There is also a lesser dependence on extension courses and those students who have not been exposed to it will at least have a sample of what campus life, away from parental restraints, is like. While the cut-back to a single year's internship may possibly increase the inclination to force the development of the interns and thus work against the establishment of productive intern-consultant relationships, fewer stations will be required in any given school system at any given time. This should make it possible to place interns in situations which will challenge them to reach farther in defining what teaching should be.

B. ON THE USES OF AN INTERNSHIP IN THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS

As is the case with any pedagogical device, an internship in teacher education can achieve a variety of purposes depending on the context in which it is employed. An internship can—as does STEP—make a college degree and certification as a teacher possible for students who would have otherwise been denied an opportunity. It may—as in the Great Depression—be used as a device to exploit beginning teachers. It may provide a shortcut around obstacles, real or imagined, established by entrenched groups who control entry into teaching. It may—as in medicine—be a means to attract and develop an elite occupation.

The medical analogy, especially, is a favorite for many who advocate a mandatory internship in teacher preparation. It is understandable that this should be so, since the introduction and spread, and eventually the requirement, of the internship in medicine paralleled a remarkable growth in the physician's competence and professional status. It is difficult to avoid the logical fallacy that, because these developments accompanied the institution of an internship, they were in some way a result of its requirement.

We believe the hope that an internship, in itself, will lead to a comparable growth in the teaching profession's status and competence is, to put it gently, misplaced. The early internship in medicine was a prize that the most committed students actively sought, and for which they were willing to sacrifice immediate financial rewards. Even more, in the period of the spread of the medical internship, science won its long contest with theology for the intellectual leadership of our society, and entry into medicine was sought by the ablest students of each generation. The internship itself came to have a kind of charisma. It is a familiar phenomenon in education. As Stroud once suggested, if Sanskrit were included as a requirement in any educational program that only the ablest students could enter or complete, their later achievements would be attributed to their study of Sanskrit. In our own time, medicine has had to compete with the natural sciences and mathematics for the ablest students and has had to dip lower into the manpower pool for its candidates. Medical educators are no longer as sanguine as they once were that the internship is an unmixed blessing; more precisely, they must now evaluate the method on its own merits.

Without correlated developments in the social matrix in which teacher education must proceed, it is difficult for us to see how the requirement of a mandatory internship, or, for that matter, any other pedagogical method, is likely to raise substantially the performance or public recognition of the teaching profession. For that to occur, an explosion in our knowledge of the teaching process will have to occur, and a re-ordering of values which would make teaching more than the contingent occupation that it is for so many of those who now prepare for it. Nor is the prospect ahead bright so long as the notion persists, that all of the more than two million persons engaged in the educational enterprise are, and should be, members of the teaching "profession." Some more careful definition of "teacher" is required. It is difficult, to say the least, to develop an elite occupation for a non-elite population.

Indications that changes may be occurring are plentiful: the exponential expansion in the funds available for research on the teaching act; the revolutionary development of the new curricula;

and, most basic, a reaffirmation of the value of education as a force for change in our society. But we have only a beginning and, if we evaluate our experience correctly, these new developments are not yet significant in shaping the performance of teachers.

But prophecies that an internship can or cannot foster the growth of an elite occupation, or achieve any other broader social objective, are undoubtedly self-fulfilling. In STEP's case, at least, it is true that the development of an elite was not part of the original intent. We are probably on safer ground to confine our remaining summary remarks to those more narrowly conceived outcomes that our analysis leads us to believe an internship may help achieve.

The internship can work against the formalism of campus-based instruction. At one level this means no more than that instructors are able to arrange for demonstrations and related activities with greater ease. But at a more significant level it means that students can exert a more active influence in shaping their studies, can participate more knowledgeably in the analysis of teaching, and can assess the worth of what they are offered on more relevant grounds. And if all of this does not necessarily insure greater numbers of superior teachers, it does at least provide a basis of denying certification on more relevant grounds. In short, movement of professional instruction from the college campus provides a hedge against the twin dangers of "busywork" and "brainwashing" and an exclusive reliance on the extrinsic rewards of grades and artificial competition to motivate students.

Whether the student receives her instruction in an off-campus setting or not, however, her teaching style and effectiveness is most importantly shaped by her evaluation of her experiences in her first assignment as a teacher, and these experiences include not only her experimentation with the techniques of teaching, but her accommodation to her building milieu. That this should be so reflects the still too limited warranted knowledge of the act of teaching that the university has to transmit to the persons who are now attracted to teaching. If our assertion is correct, then the internship, with its provision for guidance during the student's transformation into a teacher, is of critical importance. A readily accessible, nonthreatening, and knowledgeable consultant may importantly influence the beginner's assessment of her first experimental tries, and her understanding and response to the contraints on her practice.

But if the university's involvement in the achievement of these objectives is thought to be advisable, it must be purchased at a price. For to the extent it becomes involved, the university faculty must be prepared for pressure to restrict instruction to the technical, and to that which is deemed immediately applicable to the tasks in which the students are engaged. Many will not see this as a particularly high price to pay, but the danger is that an important function of the university may be curtailed: that of serving as a qualified critic of existing practice and as a force for innovation and experimentation.

Both the university and school have a common purpose, of course, in the transmittal of our culture to the new generation. But each perceives this task, or we believe each ought to, through a different window. And it is the opportunity for a direct confrontation of these legitimate but nonidentical views that may be the chief justification for the maintenance of the internship as an alternative, though not an exclusive, route in the preparation of teachers.

Internship programs may or may not produce "superior" teachers. It was not part of our purpose to determine if STEP did so. But whether internships produce "superior" teachers may be beside the point; what such programs do for those engaged in operating and teaching in them may be the more significant question. The cooperative involvement of school and university personnel in the preparation of teachers can alter both, if the "cooperation" devised is such that the separate contribution of each is valued. Evidence of such change as a result of STEP has entered into our analysis only indirectly. It is difficult to separate the effects of STEP from the many other influences working for change. But professors of education who became involved in the field operations were changed by their experience and so, we assume, were the school people.

The hope is that out of direct confrontation which the internship approach to teacher education makes possible, new problems will be explored and that the search for new knowledge and understanding of the teacher's art, in which both the schoolman and the university professor and through them, society, have such a vital stake, will be advanced.

APPENDIX A:

In this report we have used qualifiers like "typically," "some," "few," and the like in developing our main themes. This journalistic style has the advantage of implying no greater precision that our data justifies. But there are a number of items which do deserve more precise description since they are basic to the argument which is developed. Unless otherwise indicated, the data which follow describe three groups of students who were the subjects of our socialization studies and for whom extensive data were collected: the 1960 pilot STEP class, N=38; the 1961 STEP class, N=88; and a campus comparison group, N=31. The two STEP groups were intact; the campus students were a random sample of all first term juniors enrolled in elementary education in the Fall of 1960.

ITEM 1. THE SOCIOECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF THE STEP STUDENTS

Much is made in the report of the relatively disadvantaged background of those electing the STEP program. The median parental income reported by the 1960 STEP students was $5,400; by the 1961 STEP students, $4,784; and, by the campus group, $9,940. This nearly 2-1 disparity was reflected in other indices as well. For example, the data for "Father's Occupation" were as follows:

FATHER'S OCCUPATION	1960 STEP	1961 STEP	1960 CAMPUS	MASON'S DATA*
Teachers	00%	02%	03%	05%
Prof. and Semi-Prof.	00	05	27	14
Prop., Mgrs., Exec.	00	11	33	24
Clerical and Sales	18	13	27	08
Skilled	38	25	03	14
Unskilled, unemployed, other	13	41	00	16
Farm owners and workers	00	03	07	19

*3,255 beginning women elementary school teachers described by Ward Mason, *The Beginning Teacher*, Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1961, p. 137.

Thus 90% of the campus students reported their fathers in some "white-collar" position compared to half or less for each of the other groups. "Mother's Occupation," "Father's Formal Education," "Mother's Formal Education," tell a similar story. The STEP students were dissimilar to the campus group on these variables and more like the national sample of beginning teachers that Mason has described. This was also true when the sex and marital status of the students was considered. Mason's sample of elementary school teachers contained 20% men, and among the women, 46% were married. The respective percentages among the campus students were 3 and 6%; among all students enrolled in elementary education on campus only 6% are men.

The over-all conclusion is that, compared to the campus student, the STEP student was less favored economically.

ITEM 2. ACHIEVEMENT AND APTITUDE

The most appropriate comparison of the academic achievement of STEP and campus students is that between the cumulative grade point average (GPA) for the campus students' (as beginning Juniors) and the STEP students' grades during their first summer session on campus. Variations in grading practices among the community colleges make a direct comparison of cumulative GPA's difficult to interpret. After their first summer, their special situation also biases a direct comparison of GPA's at graduation in favor of the STEP students.

AVERAGE GRADES	1960 STEP	1961 STEP	1960 CAMPUS
3.00 and above	16%	23%	20%
2.50-2.99	39	23	33
2.00-2.49	34	30	45
1.99 and below	10	24	03
Mean	2.58	2.46	2.35

Two factors affect this comparison. The first is that selection on Michigan State's standards had already occurred among the campus students but was still to take place among the STEP students. Secondly, Michigan State's Office of Institutional Research consistently finds that transfer students do less well in their first term on campus. With these conditions, and the fact that a single term's work was compared with an average based on nine terms' study, the difference favoring the campus sample was less notable. We concluded that, despite differences in socioeconomic backgrounds, STEP and campus students performed about the same academically.

Michigan State routinely administers the *College Qualification Test* (CQT) battery to all new and transfer students. The relevant data were as follows:

GROUP	N	10PR	Q1	MEDIAN	Q3	90PR
Fall '61 Elem. Ed. Frosh	360	90.3	105.2	119.2	135.8	150.5
Fall '61 Elem. Ed. Transfer	112	95.6	105.9	119.9	134.9	146.4
Summer '61 STEP Transfers	88	85.2	105.3	120.5	137.2	154.8
Summer '60 STEP Transfers	38	96.5	102.5	125.0	138.2	152.5

We concluded that the STEP students were very much like other transfers in elementary education on those dimensions measured by the CQT. Comparison of transfer students with freshmen is more difficult, since the transfers have the advantage of added college studies, and one would expect them to do better. It seemed safest to conclude that no grounds existed for arguing that the STEP students were either more or less able than their campus counterparts.

ITEM 3. COMPARISON ON PERSONALITY AND INTEREST MEASURES

Several tests were employed to assess differences between STEP and campus students on a number of personality and interest variables. The results obtained for the *Edwards Personal Preference Schedule,* which purports to measure the press of 15 "needs," were representative. Tabled just below are the means for the women students of the three comparison groups; standard deviations around these means were homogeneous.

EPPS Measure	1960 Campus	1960 STEP	1961 STEP
Affiliation	19.0 (1)	16.3 (3)	16.3 (5)
Change	18.6 (2)	18.4 (2)	18.4 (2)
Intraception	18.4 (3)	19.5 (1)	19.0 (1)
Nurturance	17.5 (4)	15.3 (4)	16.8 (4)
Abasement	13.8 (5)	14.6 (6)	16.9 (3)
Exhibition	13.6 (6)	13.8 (8)	13.9 (8)
Heterosexuality	13.5 (7)	12.1 (12.5)	11.5 (13)
Dominance	12.8 (8)	12.6 (11)	12.1 (10)
Deference	12.7 (9)	14.0 (7)	14.4 (7)
Achievement	12.2 (11)	13.0 (9)	12.7 (9)
Autonomy	12.2 (11)	12.1 (12.5)	10.3 (14)
Succorance	12.2 (11)	11.2 (14)	11.7 (11.5)
Endurance	12.1 (13)	14.7 (5)	14.7 (6)
Order	10.9 (14)	12.8 (10)	11.7 (11.5)
Aggression	9.3 (15)	9.7 (15)	8.9 (15)

The EPPS is an ipsative scale and interpretation is appropriate in terms of the relative order of the component measures. On this score, what is most impressive is the similarity in the ranks of the 15 subscales among the three groups. The largest disparity was between the campus and 1960 STEP students (r = .73) and the main differences were in the rankings of the Heterosexuality, Endurance and Order scales. These differences are explained most simply by the presence of a greater number of older women among the STEP students.

Similar conclusions were drawn from comparisons of STEP and campus students on the *Allport-Vernon Scale of Values, Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale,* and the *Strong Vocational Interest* test. The one marked exception was the STEP student's performance on the *Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory,* on which they scored significantly lower. The STEP women's MTAI means were 25.0 and 37.1 for the 1960 and 1961 groups respectively; for the campus women, 55.7. The MTAI score is best interpreted as indicating the extent to which judgments about children's behavior are based on psychological points of view rather than the Puritan ethic. Interpreted in this way, the obtained differences are a further reflection of the differences in age and socioeconomic backgrounds of the STEP and campus students. It is interesting to note that those STEP women students who persisted had mean MTAI scores of 50.7 and 55.0 respectively for the two classes when the test was readministered just before they were graduated. Since persistence was not related to socioeconomic background variables, this shift suggested the impact of the training and work milieu on the attitudes of the STEP students.

APPENDIX B

CAMPUS PROJECT STAFF

William Vernon Hicks, Project Director, 1959-
R. G. Rex, Assistant Professor, 1959-62
Bernard R. Corman, Research Director, 1959-
Ann G. Olmsted, Research Associate, 1959-
Albert Elwell, Assistant Instructor, 1961-64
Lois F. Parker, Research Assistant, 1960-62
Janet Ward, Secretary, 1959-61
Suzanne Darken, Secretary, 1961-

PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE, 1959-60

Charles Blackman, Associate Professor
Calhoun Collier, Professor
Leland Dean, Assistant Dean and Professor
William Hawley, Professor
Milosh Muntyan, Professor
Loraine V. Shepard, Professor

COORDINATORS

ALPENA

Dr. Louis VanderLinde, 1960-62, Coordinator
Mr. James Gauthier, 1962-64, Coordinator

BATTLE CREEK

Dr. Earl Hogan, 1960-1963, Coordinator
Mr. Robert Schmatz, 1963- , Coordinator
Mr. Gerald Reagan, 1962-63, Assistant Coordinator
Mr. Francis Silvernail, 1963-64, Asssistant Coordinator
Mr. C. Jarvis Watring, 1964- , Assistant Coordinator

BAY CITY-SAGINAW

Dr. Frank Blackington, 1960-62, Coordinator
Dr. Harrison Gardner, 1961-64, Assistant Coordinator and Coordinator
Miss Leona Hall, 1962- , Assistant Coordinator and Coordinator
Miss Peggy Ramstad, 1962-64, Assistant Coordinator
Miss Emma Jane Sartain, 1964- , Assistant Coordinator

GRAND RAPIDS

Dr. James Hoffman, 1959- , Coordinator
Dr. Garth Errington, 1961-62, Assistant Coordinator
Mr. Walter Williams, 1962-63, Assistant Coordinator
Mr. Gene Franks, 1963- , Assistant Coordinator
Mr. Charles Nelson, 1963- , Assistant Coordinator
Mrs. Jacqueline Nickerson, 1962-64, Assistant Coordinator (part-time)
Mr. Don Nickerson, 1964- , Assistant Coordinator
Miss Donna Ide, 1964- , Assistant Coordinator

PORT HURON

Dr. W. R. Fielder, 1960-62, Coordinator
Dr. W. R. Houston, 1962-64, Coordinator
Dr. Robert Oana, 1964- , Coordinator
Mr. A. W. Ends, 1962-64, Assistant Coordinator

SOUTH MACOMB

Dr. Horton Southworth, 1959- , Coordinator
Mr. Stanton Teel, 1962-64, Assistant Coordinator
Miss Lois Ann Smith, 1963-64, Assistant Coordinator
Miss Delores Harms, 1963-63, Assistant Coordinator
Mrs. Nikki Voskuil, 1964- , Assistant Coordinator
Mrs. Evelyn Salturelli, 1964- , Assistant Coordinator

INTERN CONSULTANTS

ALPENA-OSCODA

Mrs. Ruth Seitz, 1962-63
Mrs. Ruth Richey, 1962-64
Mr. Orville Berger, 1963-64
Mrs. Margaret Crick, 1963-64

BATTLE CREEK

Miss Joanne Wheaton, 1962-
Mr. Eugene VanCleve, 1962-63
Mrs. Marion Olson, 1963-

BAY CITY-SAGINAW

Miss Helen Jacoby, 1962-64
Miss Emma Jane Sartain, 1962-64
Mrs. Catherine Piotrowski, 1963-
Mrs. Florence Jopke, 1963-
Miss Jean Cluckie, 1963-64
Mrs. Elaine Doehring, 1963-
Mrs. Vernita Lambert, 1963-
Mrs. Harriett Murphy, 1963-
Miss Winifred Murphy, 1963-
Mr. Paul Oberly, 1964-
Mr. Eugene Peck, 1963-
Mrs. Lillian Smiley, 1963-

GRAND RAPIDS

Mrs. Joanne Ayotte, 1962-
Mrs. Mary Lou Herzog, 1963-
Miss Marcia Farley, 1963-
Mrs. Marian Hills, 1963-
Mrs. Elizabeth Kerr, 1963-
Mrs. Trevah Lindberg, 1962-
Mr. Hunter Lusk, 1963-
Miss Sonya Meyer, 1963-
Mrs. Jacqueline Nickerson, 1961-
Mr. Allan Syrjala, 1962-64
Miss Ruth Tamaris, 1963-
Miss Laura Roseman, 1961-62
Miss Genevieve Wilkowski, 1961-
Miss Donna Ide, 1962-64

PORT HURON

Mr. Irvin Hayward, 1963-
Mr. James Gauthier, 1961-62
Mrs. Inez Innes, 1961-
Mrs. Phoebe Robbins, 1961-
Miss Mary Lou Warren, 1962-

SOUTH MACOMB

Mr. Richard Bantien, 1963-
Mr. Lee Houk, 1962-63
Mrs. Nell Henderson, 1962-
Mrs. Nikki Voskuil, 1962-64
Mrs. Evelyn Salturelli, 1963-64